STUDIES IN INDO-TIBETAN BUDDHIST HERMENEUTICS (5) THE *MKHAS-PA-RNAMS-'JUG-PA'I-SGO* BY SA-SKYA PAṆḌITA KUN-DGA'-RGYAL-MTSHAN[1].

PIETER C. VERHAGEN

(0) Introduction

In the present series this is the second article which is devoted to the description of a single treatise within the genre of the commentator's manual. The preceding title in the series, SIBH 4, surveyed the contents of the *Vyākhyāyukti* by the Indian scholar Vasubandhu (circa fourth/fifth century). The present article will focus on a work closely related to *Vyākhyāyukti* which was written by a Tibetan scholar who can be considered as one of the earliest exponents of Tibetan scholasticism, and which dates from the early thirteenth century.

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

The *Mkhas-pa-(rnams-)'jug-pa'i-sgo*, lit. the 'Introduction for Scholars'[2] (henceforth *MJ*) is a manual on scholastics by Sa-skya Paṇḍita Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan (1182-1251)[3]. The author of this treatise was the famous hierarch of the *Sa-skya-pa* school of Tibetan Buddhism who is generally known as Sa-skya Paṇḍita, 'the scholar from Sa-skya [monastery]'

---

[1] This research was made possible by a subsidy of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek, NWO).

[2] Jackson (1987) renders the title 'Entrance Gate for the Wise', Van der Kuijp (1996: 395) paraphrases it as 'An Introduction to Scholarship'.

[3] All references for *MJ* in this article are to the version of this text in the Sde-dge xylographic edition of the collected works of Sa-paṇ contained in the *Sa-skya-pa'i-bka'-'bum* volume *tha* (10), ff. 163r1-224r6, available in the facsimile reprint Bsod-nams-rgya-mtsho (ed.) (1968.5: 81-111).

(henceforth Sa-paṇ)[4]. This nomer clearly signalizes his preeminence not only as a religious expert but also as a scholastic specialist; Sa-paṇ is in fact considered as one of the founding masters of the scholastic traditions in the classical Tibetan Buddhist culture[5].

This important work is known to western academia primarily through the groundbreaking study by Prof. Jackson (Hamburg) consisting of an edition and annotated translation of the third chapter, with an elaborate introduction (1987)[6]. Jackson decided on a date of composition for the text of circa 1220-1230[7]. Recently Kapstein has argued that Sa-paṇ, in his *MJ*, has formulated a scholarly ideal that he has based directly on the classical Indian notions of scholastical excellence, of *pāṇḍitya*[8].

This type of text, the *Mkhas-'jug*, the introduction to scholastics, is — perhaps somewhat unexpectedly — quite rare in Tibetan literature. The only other work of this type which has gained some popularity was that by 'Jam-mgon 'Ju Mi-pham-rgya-mtsho (1846-1912) entitled *Mkhas-pa'i-tshul-la-'jug-pa'i-sgo-zhes-bya-ba'i-bstan-bcos*[9]. Comparable in some respects is the genre of *bshad-mdzod*, lit. 'treasure of explanation', a kind of compendium of the central Buddhist concepts and doctrines which was aimed primarily at a lay readership (whereas the *mkhas-'jug* type was written for monastic students)[10], examples of which are the *Shes-bya-rab-gsal* by 'Phags-pa Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan (1235-1280)[11] and the *Shes-bya-kun-khyab* by Kong-sprul Blo-gros-mtha'-yas (1813-1899)[12].

A quite detailed survey of the contents of *MJ* can be found in Jackson (1987: 191-206)[13], so I will just give a brief general outline here and

---

[4] A brief biographical sketch of Sa-paṇ based on the major indigenous sources can be found in Jackson (1987: 24-31), with a survey of the sources op. cit. p. 15-23; cf. also e.g. Tucci (1949: 101-102), Bosson (1969: 2-7), Khetsun Sangpo (1973-1980.10: 137ff.).

[5] Cf. e.g. Dreyfus (2003: 23, 103, 139), Kapstein (2003: 776-782).

[6] Cordial thanks are due to prof. Jackson for kindly providing me with a draft version of his annotated translation of the second chapter of *MJ*. Its publication, although projected, has not yet taken place at the moment of writing the present study.

[7] Cf. Jackson (1987: 64-66).

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

[9] Tachikawa (1983: no. 1579), cf. Smith (2001: 209-210).

[10] Cf. Smith (2001: 209-211).

[11] Cf. Smith (2001: 210).

[12] Cf. Smith (2001: 211, 235-237, 250-258), HSGLT 1: 166-178.

[13] And, as mentioned supra, the publication of an annotated translation of chapter two by Jackson is also forthcoming.

focus in more detail only on these parts of the text that are specifically relevant to the present topic, *in casu* the first and especially the second chapter[14].

MJ constitutes an introduction to the theory and practice of the scholastic enterprise, covering the three aspects of composition (Tib. *rtsom-pa*), exposition (*'chad-pa*) and debate (*rtsod-pa*), which correspond to the three chapters of the text[15]. These three topics constitute a generally current triad in Tibetan scholastics, albeit not necessarily in this order[16].

(1) Composition (*rtsom-pa*): 163v1-190r1
(2) Exposition (*'chad-pa*): 190r2-205r1
(3) Debate[17] (*rtsod-pa*): 205r1-223v4
     Postscript and colophon: 223v4-224r6

(2) Chapter 1: On Composition

Preceded by a general introduction (I.1-6,[18] 163v1-165r6), the first chapter, under the heading 'introduction to composition' (*rtsom-pa-la-'jug-pa*, 165r5-6, 190r1), is primarily devoted to linguistical topics[19]. After a brief section on the required elements in the introductory parts of a scholastical treatise (I.7-12, 165r6-167r6), it deals with a wide range of topics in the fields of grammar (I.13-51, 167r6-173v2) and poetics (I.52-end, 173v2-189v6).

Among the topics touched on in the section on grammar we find a number of typological categorizations, the first and most important of which is a classification of the basic units of language in a model of three levels: 'phoneme' (*yi-ge*), 'word' (*ming*) and 'phrase' (*tshig*) which Sa-paṇ introduces sub I.13-14. This schema corresponds of course to the

---

[14] I am not including any detailed information on the third chapter of *MJ* for two reasons: its contents are not immediately relevant for the present investigation, and it is accessible through the excellent study and annotated translation of Jackson (1987).

[15] For earlier general characterizations of *MJ*, cf. Jackson (1987: 39-42).

[16] Cf. Jackson (1987: 192-193).

[17] One is tempted to consider the alternative translation of the three topics as: (1) composition, (2) exposition and (3) opposition.

[18] Following Jackson (1987: 241-242), I have included the six introductory verses and the six concluding verses in the consecutive numbering of the first and the third chapter respectively.

[19] For a brief survey of the contents of the first chapter, cf. Jackson (1987: 193-194).

threefold categorization into the levels or, more literally, 'collectives' (Skt. *kāya*, Tib. *tshogs*) of language, scil.:

    (1) *vyañjana-kāya* (Tib. *yi-ge'i-tshogs*), 'the collective of phonemes'
    (2) *nāma-kāya* (Tib. *ming-gi-tshogs*), 'the collective of words'
    (3) *pada-kāya* (Tib. *tshig-gi-tshogs*), 'the collective of phrases'

These are generally current among the ontological categories in the various *Abhidharma* traditions in Buddhism, *locus classicus* being *Abhidharmakośa* II.47[20].

Sa-paṇ defines the three levels as follows:

'That which itself does not indicate a content one wishes to express, [but] which functions as the basis of all expression[s?], is termed 'phoneme' (*yi-ge*)' […] '[i.e.] the vowels [and] the consonants' […] 'their subdivisions and combinations will not be discussed here.' (I.13)[21]

'That which consists of a combination of phonemes and indicates [lit. a singularity of meaning, i.e.] one discrete meaning is a 'word' (*ming*)' (I.14a-c2)[22] (for which he gives as examples: *ka-ba* 'pillar', *bum-pa* 'vase', 167v4)

'That which indicates a specification of that [scil. a semantic specification] is termed a 'phrase' (*tshig*)' (I.14c3-d)[23] (examples: *ka-ba-ring-po* 'the long pillar' or perhaps 'the pillar is long', *bum-pa-bzang-po* 'the excellent vase' or 'the vase is excellent', 167v5)

Higher levels are added also: firstly that of 'sentence' (*ngag*, I.15), then the levels of paragraph, chapter, etc. (I.16), which are all, probably, within the scope of the three-level model subsumed under the third level of 'phrase' (*tshig*). This three-level *Abhidharma* model of language does not correspond to the derivational model which the indigenous Sanskrit grammarians used and which involved the verbal roots as primary bases from which free lexical word forms are derived on the second level, which in

---

[20] Cf. HSGLT 2: 241-245 and Verhagen (2002: 154-155).

[21] [I.13:] *dngos-su-brjod-'dod-mi-ston-cing-* // *brjod-pa-kun* [?] *gyi-gzhir-gyur-pa* // *yi-ge-zhes-bshad*, 167r6-167v1 (…) [I.13c cont.:] *dbyangs-gsal-byed*, 167v1 (…) [I.13d:] / *de-yi-dbye-bsdu-'dir-ma-bshad*, 167v3; on the splitting of the verse, cf. Jackson (1987: 241). Sub I.13d Sa-paṇ refers to *Smra-sgo* etc. for a more elaborate description of phonology (167v3).

[22] [I.14:] / *yi-ge-'dus-pa'i-bdag-nyid-can* // *don-gyi-ngo-bo-brda-sprod-pa* // *ming-yin*, 167v3.

[23] [I.14 cont.:] / *de-'i-khyad-par-dag (/) / ston-pas-tshig-ces-rab-tu-bshad*, 167v5.

their turn form the basis for the derivation of the third level of the bound syntactic word forms[24]. Sa-paṇ seems to have been perfectly aware of this discrepancy, postponing his treatment of aspects of the grammarians' model until later in this chapter, in particular in his summary discussions of case grammar (I.38-39), of verbal formation (I.50) and of a definition of 'sentence' which is more in line with the grammarians' view (I.51).

Further typological classifications are introduced in the distinction between 'arbitrary designations' (*brda*, identified with *'dod-rgyal-gyi-sgra*) and 'conventionally established' or 'derivative designations' (*tha-snyad* = *rjes-sgrub-kyi-sgra*) (I.17-18) and the distinction between 'class-words' (*rigs-kyi-sgra*), i.e. nouns in general, and 'name-words' (*ming-gi-sgra*), i.e. proper nouns (I.30-33). Sa-paṇ also used the former categorization in the second chapter of *MJ*, in the autocommentary on II.10 (cf. infra, sub 3.3). In his treatment of the latter categorization, Sa-paṇ introduces a quote from Dignāga which has thus far unfortunately defied identification[25].

In fact, both of the latter two classifications may be associated with Dignāga, in particular his commentary ad *Pramāṇasamuccaya* I.3d, where we find a fivefold typology of words[26]:

1. *yadṛcchā-śabda*, 'arbitrary words' i.e. proper nouns (*yadṛcchāśabdeṣu nāmnā viśiṣṭo 'rtha ucyate ḍittha iti*)
2. *jāti-śabda,* 'genus-words' i.e. nouns (*jātiśabdeṣu jātyā gaur iti*)
3. *guṇa-śabda*, 'quality-words' i.e. adjectives (*guṇaśabdeṣu guṇena śukla iti*)
4. *kriyā-śabda*, 'action-words' i.e. verbs (*kriyāśabdeṣu kriyayā pācaka iti*)
5. *dravya-śabda*, 'substance-words' i.e. [another type? of] nouns (*dravya-śabdeṣu dravyeṇa daṇḍī viṣāṇīti*)

In this section Sa-paṇ summarily discusses some further details on various forms of metaphorical designations (I.23-26) and unusual types of words, inter alia onomatopoeiae (I.27-29), which is followed by a brief section on epistemological aspects of language (I.30-37) including

---

[24] Cf. HSGLT 2: 240-251.

[25] Sub I.30: *don-brjod-pa'i-sgra-thams-cad-rigs-kyi-sgra-dang-ming-gi-sgra-yin-no-zhes-phyogs-kyi-glang-pos-gsungs-so*, 169v5, which amounts in fact to the paraphrase of Sa-paṇ's verse I.30: / *don-la-'jug-pa'i-sgra-ji-snyed* // *de-kun-rigs-dang-ming-du-'dus* /, 169v4-169v5.

[26] Hattori (1968: 25, 83-85), Franco (1984), Jackson (1987: 194).

references to the *apoha* (Tib. *gzhan-sel*) theory of the meaning of words
(I.35-36) and to the twofold typology of negations (Skt. *paryudāsa* and
prasajya-pratiṣedha, Tib. *min-dgag* and *med-dgag*; I.36)[27]. Other topics
within the field of linguistics which pass under review here are: the main
points of Sanskrit case grammar insofar as relevant for his Tibetan read-
ership involving also some comparisons between Sanskrit and Tibetan
case grammar (I.38-46)[28]; the role of the speaker's intention (Skt. *vivakṣā*,
Tib. *brjod-'dod*; I.47-48, cf. also I.26) introducing a quotation from Dhar-
makīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika*[29]; some extremely summary statements about
the verb in Sanskrit (I.50) and, finally, a definition of a sentence accord-
ing to the Sanskrit grammarians (I.51)[30], different from his discussion of
this subject earlier in this chapter in the context of the *Abhidharma* model
of language (I.15, cf. supra).

The final major section of this first chapter deals with poetics, basing
its treatment primarily on Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* (seventh-early eighth
century CE), in fact for a considerable part consisting of translations of
portions of the first two chapters of *Kāvyādarśa*. This classical Sanskrit
work on the theory and practice of poetical composition, focusing in par-
ticular on a great variety of poetical figures, came to occupy a central
position as a manual for poetics in the Tibetan literary world as well.
A later translation, by Shong-ston Rdo-rje-rgyal-mtshan and Lakṣmīṃkara,
was included in the *Bstan-'gyur*, and throughout the history of Tibetan

---

[27] Referring to his own epistemological treatise, the *Tshad-ma-rigs-pa'i-gter*, for a more
detailed treatment of the *apoha* theory (170v1) and the concepts of negation and affirma-
tion (170v5), and, in connection with the types of negation, referring generally to 'gram-
matical treatises' for further information (170v4).

[28] Cf. SIBH 7, paragraph 2.1.

[29] *brjod-par-'dod-pa'i-gzhan-dbang-phyir // sgra-rnams-gang-la'ang-med-ma-yin*,
172v5, i.e. *Pramāṇa-vārttika* 2.16ab: *vivakṣā-paratantratvān na śabdāḥ santi kutra vā /*.

[30] In addition to the definition in the verse I.51 proper, Sa-paṇ also quotes a definition
from *Amarakośa* in the auto-commentary: *a-ma-ra-ko-śā-las / sup-dang-ti-nga'i-mtha'-can-
ngag / ces-bshad-pa'i-phyir-ro*, 173v2. Ultimately this definition can be traced to the basic
treatise of Sanskrit indigenous grammar, Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, where *sūtra* 1.4.14 introduces
and defines the technical term *pada*, in this context meaning 'bound, syntactic word form',
as: *sUP-tiṄ-antam padam*, '[An element] ending in a nominal case-ending (*sUP*) or in a
verbal personal ending (*tiṄ*) is [technically termed] a bound, syntactic word form (*pada*)'.
Note that the Tibetan translation *ngag* for Sanskrit *pada* is not the standard rende-
ring, which would be *tshig*.

literature scholars have occupied themselves with this text[31]. This partial translation by Sa-paṇ in *MJ* appears to be the earliest Tibetan version of *Kāvyādarśa*, as such forming the first introduction of the Indic theories of *kāvya* 'poetry' or *alaṃkāra-śāstra*, 'the science of the poetical figures', in the Tibetan cultural sphere[32].

In the section on grammar, Sa-paṇ deals primarily with Sanskrit grammar[33], basing his treatment — as he himself states at the beginning of this segment — on the models provided by the indigenous Indic traditions of grammar and related sciences. In the commentary ad I.3, he stresses that his *MJ* does not involve 'own fabrications or the products of mental obscuration'[34], but that he has based this *MJ* compendium on his careful 'study and investigation'[35] of the 'most famous and widespread'[36] of the relevant Indian treatises, documenting this by an impressive enumeration of sources which he used for the composition of this work (164v2-165r1). The sources which he lists belong to the fields of grammar, poetics, lexicography etc., as well as a wide variety of non-language-related technical disciplines and, of course, the entire range of Buddhist canonical religious literature. He lists the following titles and genres[37]:

    (1) 'The grammars *Kalāpa* [i.e. *Kātantra*], *Cāndra* etc.'[38]
    (2) 'The epistemological treatises (*Pramāṇa*-) *Samuccaya* [by Dignāga] and the seven treatises [by Dharmakīrti] etc.'[39]

---

[31] Cf e.g. Ruegg (1995: 126), Van der Kuijp (1996).

[32] Cf. Jackson (1987: 194), Van der Kuijp (1996: 395).

[33] Now, in afterthought, having investigated the contents of *MJ* in more detail than I had done at the time, it has become clear to me that it would have been proper to include this text also in my survey of the Tibetan literature on Sanskrit grammar in HSGLT 2, in particular on account of the considerable intrinsic interest of the passages on Sanskrit grammar in *MJ*. I will attempt to make up for this omission in part in the present article and SIBH 7, although of course the primary focus here is not on grammar per se. Perhaps there will be occasion in the future to document this and other addenda to HSGLT 2, a number of which have already come to my notice.

[34] *rang-bzo-dang-mun-sprul*, 165r1.

[35] *mthong-zhing-thos-nas-'dris-par-byas-pa-yin*, 165r1.

[36] *yongs-su-grags-pa-phal-che-ba*, 165r1.

[37] This passage is also translated and discussed in Kapstein (2003: 778-780).

[38] *sgra'i-bstan-bcos-ka-lā-pa-dang- / tsandra-pa-la-sogs-pa*, 164v2; for this literature, cf. HSGLT 1.

[39] *tshad-ma'i-bstan-bcos-kun-las-btus-dang- / rab-tu-byed-pa-sde-bdun-la-sogs-pa*, 164v2; the seven works of Dharmakīrti, of course, being *Pramāṇavārttika*, *Pramāṇaviniścaya*,

(3) 'The poetical works *Jātaka*(-*mālā*?), the three major and the three lesser [works?] etc.'[40]

(4) 'The treatises on metrics (*Chando-*)*Ratnākara* and *Sdeb-sbyor-gyi-tshoms* etc.'[41]

(5) 'The treatise on the poetical figures [by] Daṇḍi[n] [i.e. *Kāvyādarśa*] and the *Sarasvatīkāṇṭhābharaṇa* etc.'[42]

(6) 'The lexicographical works *Amarakośa* and *Viśvaprakāśa* etc.'[43]

(7) 'The dramaturgical works [lit. treatises] *Nāgānanda* and **Rūpamañjarī* etc.'[44]

Nyāyabindu, *Hetubindu*, *Vādanyāya*, *Saṃbandhaparīkṣā* and *Saṃtānāntarasiddhi*; on Buddhist epistemology and its history in Tibet, cf. recently Dreyfus (1997) and Tillemans (1999).

[40] *snyan-ngag-gi-bstan-bcos-skyes-pa'i-rabs-dang-* / *chen-po-gsum-dang-* / *chung-ngu-gsum-la-sogs-pa*, 164v2-164v3; Kapstein (2003: 780 n. 94) explicates: "As he explains elsewhere, "three great" refers to three of the major Sanskrit poets, beginning with Bhāravi, while "three lesser" refers specifically to the works of Kālidāsa, beginning with *Kumārasaṃbhava*". Cf. Ruegg (1995: 111-112, 124-125). Or does the phrase 'the three major and the three lesser' refer to the three major and three minor works of a specific author, perhaps the most renowned Sanskrit poet Kālidāsa, who wrote three plays (*Abhijñāna-śakuntalā*, *Mālavikāgnimitra* and *Vikramorvaśī*) and four poems (three being the most famous, scil. *Kumārasaṃbhava*, *Raghuvaṃśa* and *Meghadūta*)?

[41] *sdeb-sbyor-gyi-bstan-bcos-rin-chen-'byung-gnas-dang-* / *sdeb-sbyor-gyi-tshoms-la-sogs-pa*, 164v3. The former title is readily identifiable as the famous work on metrics by Ratnākaraśānti which was later included in *Bstan-'gyur*. It is unclear which text is referred to under the latter title, lit. 'Bundle [or garland?] of metrics' or 'Chapter on metrics': perhaps Jñānaśrīmitra's *Vṛttamālāstuti* 'Praise in the form of a garland of meters', a thirteenth-century translation of which was included in *Bstan-'gyur* as well; or perhaps the classical Sanskrit works *Chandoviciti*, 'Investigation of metrics', or *Chandomañjarī*, 'Cluster of flowers of metrics', which do not seem to have been rendered into Tibetan? Cf. Ruegg (1995: 127), Kapstein (2003: 780 n. 94).

[42] *tshig-gi-rgyan-gyi-bstan-bcos-daṇḍī-dang-* / *dbyangs-can-gyi-mgul-rgyan-la-sogs-pa*, 164v3. On the former work, first introduced in Tibetan scholastics by Sa-paṇ in the present work, cf. supra. The latter is probably the well known treatise on poetics, attributed to Bhoja(deva) (eleventh century), though a work on Sanskrit grammar with the same title and by the same author is also known, cf. Renou (1940: 44); I am not aware of a Tibetan translation of either work by Bhoja.

[43] *ming-gi-nges-brjod-a-ma-ra-ko-ṣā-dang-* / *sna-tshogs-gsal-ba-la-sogs-pa*, 164v4; the second lexicon mentioned here can most likely be identified as the *Viśvaprakāśa* by the twelfth-century author Maheśvara Kavi, cf. Vogel (1979: 329-331). A second, far less probable identification would be the *Viśvalocana* lexicon by Śrīdharasena, cf. Vogel (1976), (1979: 348-350), Ruegg (1995: 130), SIBH 7 ad *MJ* II.23.

[44] *zlos-gar-gyi-bstan-bcos-glu* [emend: *klu*] *-rnams-rab-tu-dga'-ba-dang-* / *gzugs-kyi-snye-ma-la-sogs-pa*, 164v4. For Harṣadeva's *Nāgānanda*, 'Joy of the Serpents', which is also contained in *Bstan-'gyur*, cf. Hahn (1981), Hahn, Steiner and Ghoṣa (1991), Ruegg (1995: 128). Can the latter (*Gzugs-kyi-snye-ma*) be identified as the well-known play

(8) 'The medical treatise *Aṣṭāṅga* [-*hṛdaya*] and [other] medical traditions etc.'[45]

(9) '[Treatises] on arts and crafts, [on] the iconographical proportions, [on] the expertise regarding earth, water, etc.'[46]

(10) '[Treatises] on prognostication with regard to external [elements] such as the lunar mansions etc. and on prognostication with regard to internal [elements] such as wind etc.'[47]

(11) '[Texts] that have Buddhist and non-Buddhist aspects, [such as] *Kālacakra* (-*tantra*) and the treatise written by Śrīdhara(-sena)'[48]

(12) 'Within Buddhism, the three *Piṭaka*s of *Sūtra*, *Vinaya* and *Abhidharma*, and the four *Tantra* classes of *Kriyā*, *Caryā*, *Yoga* and *Yoga-niruttara*, along with the commentaries and subcommentaries on these[49], etc.'[50]

One should probably regard this statement of Sa-paṇ's sources of expertise — and similar passages elsewhere in his œuvre — as reflecting an ideal

Gzugs-kyi-nyi-ma? Cf. Bacot (1957). Concerning the latter identification, Kapstein (2003: 780 n. 94) observes that its "known versions must postdate Sa-skya Paṇḍita by several centuries".

[45] *sman-dpyad-kyi-bstan-bcos-yan-lag-brgyad-pa-dang-* / *gso-ba-rig-pa-la-sogs-pa*, 164v4-164v5; the work mentioned is of course the famous medical handbook by Vāgbhaṭa, also contained in *Bstan-'gyur*; cf. Vogel (1965), Ruegg (1995: 110-111).

[46] *bzo-rig-pa-sku-gzugs-kyi-chag-tshad-dang-* / *sa-dang-chu-la-sogs-pa'i-brtag-pa*, 164v5; cf. Ruegg (1995: 109-110).

[47] *phyi-rol-gyi-rgyu-skar-la-sogs-pa'i-rtsis-dang-* / *nang-gi-rlung-la-sogs-pa'i-rtsis*, 164v5; a possible alternative translation would be 'Non-Buddhist [treatises] on prognostication with regard to lunar mansions etc. and Buddhist [treatises] on prognostication with regard to the [elements] wind etc.'; cf. Ruegg (1995: 108-109). Kapstein (2003: 779) translates here: "The calculation of the constellations *[nakṣatra]*, among external objects, and of the inner vital energies *[vāyu]*, and so on, (…)", for continuation of his translation, see the next note.

[48] *nang-pa-dang-phyi-rol-pa'i-bye-brag-dus-kyi-'khor-lo-dang-* / *dpal-'dzin-gyis-byas-pa'i-bstan-bcos*, 164v5-164v6. The *Kālacakratantra* is well-known for containing references to other religions and their adherents, in particular to the Islam, cf. e.g. Newman (1998); Śrīdharasena was the Jain author of the lexicon *Viśvalocana* which found its way into the Buddhist literature as well, cf. SIBH 7 ad *MJ* II.23. Kapstein (2003: 779) combines this and the preceding category, translating the latter part: "(…), including the *Wheel of Time [Kālacakra]*, which is a speciality of both Buddhists and non-Buddhists, and the treatise by Śrīdhara", and suggests that "[t]he work of Śrīdhara here mentioned is probably the *Triśatika*".

[49] I.e. on the three *Piṭaka*s and the four *Tantra*-classes; or, far less probably, on all the treatises mentioned above?

[50] *nang-rig-pa-la-mdo-sde-dang-* / *'dul-ba-dang-* / *mngon-pa'i-sde-snod-gsum-dang-* / *bya-ba-dang-* / *spyod-pa-dang-* / *rnal-'byor-dang-* / *rnal-'byor-bla-na-med-pa'i-rgyud-sde-bzhi-dang-* / *de-dag-gi-'grel-pa-dang-* / *'grel-bshad-la-sogs-pa*, 164v6-165r1.

of scholarship (Skt. *pāṇḍitya*) derived from the classical Indic culture
which he set forth with great self-confidence but also with full apprecia-
tion of the demands it imposes, not, therefore, an expression of mere self-
aggrandizement; but as an ideal which he himself has emulated and which
other Tibetan scholastics should aspire for[51].

This type of testimonium of sources at the outset of a technical trea-
tise in the Indo-Tibetan traditions is by no means unique. We have, for
instance, comparable enumerations in the introductory sections of the
Kātantra commentary by Sa-bzang Mati Paṇ-chen Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan
(1292-1376)[52] and the *Cāndra* commentary by Si-tu Paṇ-chen Chos-kyi-
'byung-gnas (1699?-1774)[53].

(3) Chapter 2: On Exposition

The second chapter of *MJ* deals with the principles of expounding the
doctrine, in particular in the form of explaining and commenting on doc-
trinal scripture, involving the analysis and interpretation of such scripture,
and the specific techniques required for communicating such matters to
a Tibetan audience. This chapter is structured on the five hermeneutical
categories as formulated in Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*, which we have
seen in article (4) in this series[54].

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

---

[51] Cf. Kapstein (2003: 777-780).
[52] Cf. HSGLT 2: 93-94.
[53] Cf. HSGLT 2: 172-179.
[54] Scil. SIBH 4; for a brief survey of the contents of the second chapter of *MJ*, cf.
Jackson (1987: 195-196).

The body of the chapter, i.e. the treatment of the above five categories is preceded by brief discusssions of the required properties of the teacher (II.2a), the student (II.2b) and the doctrine (II.2c)[55] and the interaction between these three (II.3).

(3.1) *Chapter 2.1: Intention*

For the first category, 'purpose' or 'intention', Sa-paṇ merely states that this point is well known and does not need any further expatiation[56]. He had indeed already spoken of this subject, albeit briefly, sub *MJ* I.12, on the necessity of stating the purpose at the beginning of a treatise[57]. There he had introduced a quotation from Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*[58]:

> 'If he [i.e. the student] has heard the greatness [i.e. importance] of the *Sūtra* and its meaning [or:… the greatness of the meaning of the *Sūtra*], it generates respect in the student, so that he will study it and take it [to heart]; therefore the intention [of the *Sūtra*] must be stated at the outset [by the commentator].'

He had also listed four aspects of 'purpose': (1) the 'subject matter' (*brjod-bya*), (2) the 'purpose' (*dgos-pa*), (3) the 'ulterior purpose' (*dgos-pa'i-dgos-pa*) and (4) their 'connection' (*'brel-pa*) there (f. 167r5). This set of terms, commonly known as *dgos-'brel* (prob. '[the set of] purpose, connection [etc.]') usually also contains a fifth element, viz. the 'text' (*rjod-byed*), but as is the case here in *MJ*, this is sometimes omitted, presumably — as Broido (1983: 7) suggested — "since it is taken for granted"[59].

---

[55] On the splitting of II.2a, -b and -c, cf. Jackson (1987: 241 & note 39).

[56] *thog-mar-dgos-pa'i-don-dgos-'brel-gyi-ngag-yin-la / de-thams-cad-grags-pas-re-zhig-bzhag-go*, f. 191r5-191r6.

[57] Jackson (1987: 195): "The first of these Sa-paṇ had already touched on in his discussion of the preliminary parts of the treatise (I 12). This topic in any case seems to have been already commonly understood by the Tibetans of his time."; Dreyfus (2003: 185): "(1) A commentary should explain the purpose of the text, whether through an homage or through an explicit statement of purpose at the beginning of the text.".

[58] *dang-po-dgos-pa-ni-rnam-bshad-rigs-pa-las / mdo-don-che-ba-nyid-thos-nas // nyan-dang-len-pa-la-sogs-la // nyan-pa-po-de-gus-'gyur-bas // thog-mar-dgos-pa-brjod-par-bya // zhes-gsungs-so*, f. 167r3-167r4; corresponding to *Vyākhyāyukti* Peking *Bstan-'gyur* f. 34r1-34r2: *mdo-don-che-ba-nyid-thos-na // nyan-pa-dang-ni-'dzin-pa-la // nyan-pa-po-ni-gus-byed-pas // thog-mar-dgos-pa-brjod-par-bya*; cf. also SIBH 4 paragraph 3.

[59] On *dgos-'brel* in general, cf. e.g. Broido (1983).

(3.2) *Chapter 2.2: Summary.*

In the brief section on the second category, the 'summary' or 'summarized meaning', Sa-paṇ distinguishes two types[60], sub II.4: the general summary of a text[61] and the summary enumerating the individual topics dealt with in a text or in a portion of a text[62]. Sa-paṇ further elaborates somewhat (sub II.4 and in particular II.5) on the qualities which a proper summary should have and what defects should be avoided when composing one, stressing such qualities as brevity and clarity of phrasing, and comprehensiveness with regard to its subject matter.

As regards the first type, in the previous chapter (sub I.11), our author had already discussed the necessity of a summary presentation of, as he calls it, 'the body of the treatise' (*bstan-bcos-lus*, 166v4) at the beginning of a commentary, outlining the general contents of the text commented on[63].

Here, in the second chapter, he adds that:

> 'When commenting on a basic text which is both difficult and extensive, at the outset one should make a summary [stating] "This is the topic of this basic treatise". [Such a summary statement] may actually be present in that basic treatise. But if [such a summary statement] is necessary, yet not actually present in that [basic text], one should present [such] a statement summarizing the topic in such a manner that it is brief, easy to understand and easy to retain [in memory], basing [that summary] on other basic treatises on scripture and reasoning.'[64]

As for the second type of summary, Sa-paṇ states[65]:

---

[60] Jackson (1987: 195): "(2) summaries, of which he discerned two main types: (a) concise summaries of the general topic, and (b) more detailed topical outlines (II 4-5). He explained the desired traits and possible defects of each."; Dreyfus (2003: 185): "(2) A commentary should summarize its subject, either concisely or in more detailed topical outlines."

[61] *ngag-don-bsdus* (191r6), *spyi'i-bsdus-don* (191v3).

[62] *gzhung-don-so-so'i-bsdus-don* (191r6), *gzhung-lugs-so-so'i-bsdus-don* (191v2), *bye-brag-gi-bsdus-don* (191v3).

[63] *bshad-sla-ba-dang-gzung-bde-zhing- // bstan-bcos-la-yang-rtsod-bral-phyir // mkhas-pa-la-la-bstan-bcos-lus // bsdus-te-thog-mar-dgod-pa-mdzad*, MJ I.11, 166v4.

[64] *gzhung-dka'-zhing-rgya-che-ba-bshad-pa-na / thog-mar-gzhung-'di'i-ngag-don-'di-yin-zhes-bsdus-te / gzhung-de-la-dngos-su-yod-kyang-rung- / de-la-nye-bar-mkho-na-dngos-su-med-kyang-lung-dang-rigs-pa'i-gzhung-gzhan-nas-blangs-te / nyung-zhing-'dus-la-go-bde-zhing-gzung-sla-ba'i-ngag-don-bsdus-te-thog-mar-bshad-do*, 191r6-191v1.

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

'Taking into consideration the entire basic text, from the beginning to the end, one should establish the main general sections[66] [in the basic text] each separately on the basis of an analysis of the various topics discussed [in that text] that are categorically similar or dissimilar. [Doing this] one should parse [the text] in such a manner that the internal subdivisions are consistent [with one another].'

It should be mentioned at this point that by the time of Sa-paṇ the summary had actually even developed into a separate genre of commentary, starting from the numerous 'Summary' (*bsdus-don*) type of commentaries written by Rngog-lo-tsā-ba Blo-ldan-shes-rab (1059-1109)[67].

Elsewhere[68] I have looked at the possibility that the second type of summary which Sa-paṇ discusses here can be identified as the well-known *sa-bcad* or 'topical outline' device, which is widely used throughout the Tibetan commentary literature. The origin of this *sa-bcad* form of analysis is unknown. Thus far no unmistakable models for it have come to light in Indian literature. It may then be a Tibetan innovation. It is however also quite conceivable that it stems from antecedents in Chinese scholastics. In the latter scenario this would imply that, at least at his point, Sa-paṇ is not reflecting merely Indian models and ideals of scholastics, but also Chinese.

(3.3) *Chapter 2.3: Meaning of Words*.

The third section, on the 'meaning of words', is by far the most elaborate section of the second chapter (II.6-30). Initially the author distinguishes two aspects of the explanation of words (*ngag-gi-don-bshad*, 192v2)[69]:

---

[66] Tentative translation for *spyi'i-sdom* = Skt. *piṇḍoddāna* "abridged summary or statement of contents", Edgerton (1953-2: 345). The usual Tibetan translation is *bsdus-pa'i-sdom*; but one also finds *spyi'i-sdom*, cf. Eimer (1983-1: 25).

[67] Cf. e.g. Dreyfus (2003: 137).

[68] SIBH 7, paragraph 3.

[69] Cf. Jackson (1987: 195): "when explaining (3) how to expound the sense of the words, he likewise distinguished two methods: (a) the explaining of compound words, and (b) the method of commenting word-by-word. The first mainly applies to Sanskrit, so he did not develop it in much detail (II 6-7)" and Dreyfus (2003: 185): "(3) It [Verhagen: a commentary] should explain the meaning of the text by glossing each word, explaining relevant grammatical notions, and providing the literary background of the discussion. It should analyze compound words — a function far more important in the Indian tradition than the Tibetan, as such words do not exist in the Tibetan language".

    (1) Explanation regarding the 'compounding [or, more literally, joining together] of words' (*tshig-gi-sbyor-ba*, 192v2)[70]

    (2) 'Explanation of words' proper (perhaps rather 'the individual explanation of words' (?), *tshig-rnam-par-bshad-pa'i-tshul*, 192v3)[71]

The former is limited to an extremely terse introduction to the topic, in fact barely more than a mere enumeration of the six types of nominal compounds in Sanskrit (II.7; 192v3-192v5), referring the reader who wishes to know more about the subject to 'other grammatical treatise(s)' by Sa-paṇ himself[72] and to *Smra-sgo-mtshon-cha* by Smṛtijñānakīrti, etc[73].

The latter, far broader topic is elaborated on in the remainder of this section (II.8-30; 192v5-203r3). First Sa-paṇ addresses elementary sentence analysis, offering a brief partial treatment of the *kāraka*s, the system of syntactic-semantic relations in indigenous Sanskrit grammar[74] (II.8-9), this only 'as far as required for Tibetans'[75]. He then applies this to three sample passages, viz. from Nāgārjuna's *Mūla-madhyamaka-kārikā* (193r3-193v3), from Haribhadra's *Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā* (193v3-193v6), and from the *Vajra-vidāraṇa-dhāraṇī* (193v6-194r4). Note that earlier in the text, Sa-paṇ had already touched on the topic of the *kāraka*s in connection with case-grammar (sub I.39).

In this section, sub II.9, we also find quotation from a 'grammatical treatise' (*sgra'i-bstan-bcos*) which has thus far — tantalizingly — defied exact identification. Speaking of 'the methods of expounding the extensive and difficult scriptural traditions', he offers the following citation[76]:

---

[70] Note that a possible translation for *tshig-gi-sbyor-ba* would be 'formation of words'; taking into consideration that Sa-paṇ only speaks of nominal compound forms here, and that word-formation in Sanskrit in general would involve many other types of formation as well, I have not opted for this interpretation here.

[71] Cf. Jackson (1987: 195): "the method of commenting word-by-word".

[72] *kho-bos-byas-pa'i-sgra'i-bstan-bcos-gzhan*, 192v4-192v5; Sa-paṇ gives a more elaborate exposé on compound formation in *Sgra-la-'jug-pa* (228v1-232v2); cf. also *Yi-ge'i-sbyor-ba* 212-215 (249v3-4); on the former text, cf. HSGLT 2: 64-65, on the latter, cf. Miller (1993: 130-153), HSGLT 2: 70.

[73] *smra-sgo-la-sogs-par-blta-bar-bya'o*, 192v5; *Smra-sgo* deals with *samāsa* in verses 235-315; on *Smra-sgo* in general, cf. HSGLT 2: 37-53.

[74] On this system, cf. e.g. HSGLT 2: 278-284.

[75] *'dir-bod-la-nye-bar-mkho-ba'i-bshad-tshul-cung-zad-brjod-par-bya*, 193r1.

[76] *'di-la-sgra'i-bstan-bcos-las / seng-ge'i-lta-stangs-kyis-khyad-par-gyi-gzhi-blang- / sbal-pa'i-'phar-bas-skabs-don-so-sor-dbye / rus-sbal-gyi-'gros-kyis-tshig-don-'jebs -par-bshad*

"One should identify the specific topic with the gaze of the lion.
One should distinguish the subjects of the [various] sections with the leap
of the frog.
One should explain the meaning of the words in an elegant manner with the
gait of the tortoise."

The bearing of the stanza seems to be that the commentator should
pick out the main topic of a text or passage with the far-reaching all-see-
ing gaze of the lion, surveying the entirety of the text; that he should
bring out the topics of the different segments in a text, dexterously jump-
ing from one to the next like a frog; and, finally, that he should go through
the entire text, commenting on each relevant passage or word as if with
the slow, careful and precise gait of the tortoise.

The terms 'gaze of the lion' and 'leap of the frog' may be traceable to
the technical idiom of Sanskrit indigenous grammar[77], although the use
of these terms in that context does not correspond precisely to what we
find here. The 'gaze of the lion' (*seng-ge'i-lta-stangs*) can be likened to
the *siṃhāvalokita-* or *siṃhāvalokana-nyāya*, the 'maxim of the lion's
backward glance'[78] which is used, e.g. in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* commentary on
Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.3.49, to indicate the 'transportation' of a term 'into' a rule
from a *later* rule in *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, a phenomenon technically called *apakarṣa*,
'drawing back'[79]. "It is used when one casts a retrospective glance at
what [one] has left behind, while at the same time [one] is proceeding,
just as the lion, while going onward in search of prey, now and then bends
his neck backwards to see if any thing be within the reach"[80], the rule
which occurs later in the text as it were 'glancing backwards' to the pre-
ceding rule to which the term in question is 'transported'. This is a very rare
procedure, being a subtype of the generally applied grammarians' device
of *anuvṛtti*, the 'transporting' of a term or terms from a *preceding* rule to
a *later* one[81].

/ *ces-'byung-bas-de-dag-gi-tshul-dang-bstun-te* / *ghzung-lugs-rgya-che-zhing-dka'-ba-rnams-bshad-par-bya'o*, 194r5-194r6.

[77] In his draft translation of this chapter Jackson had already identified the two possible
antecedents in Sanskrit *vyākaraṇa* terminology.

[78] Cf. Renou (1942-2: 339), Abhyankar (1977: 428).

[79] Cf. Renou (1942-1: 46-47), Abhyankar (1977: 32, s.v. *apakarṣa* (ii)).

[80] Vasu (1891-1: 503).

[81] Cf. Renou (1942-1: 33), Abhyankar (1977: 26), HSGLT 2: 225, 227, 229-230.

The *vyākaraṇa* parallel to *MJ*'s 'leap of the frog' (*sbal-pa'i-'phar-ba*) is
also a subtype of *anuvṛtti*, of far more common occurrence than the former,
termed *maṇḍūkagati*, 'gait of the frog' or *maṇḍūkapluti*, 'leap of the frog'[82].
This refers to the 'transportation' of a term from a rule, not to the rule(s)
immediately subsequent to it, but to a (group of) rule(s) that occurs some-
what later in the text, skipping the intermediate rules with the 'leap of a frog'.

Regrettably I have not been able to identify any such parallel for the
third metaphor in this quotation in *MJ*, 'the gait of the tortoise' (*rus-sbal-
gyi-'gros*). One might consider Sanskrit antecedents such as **kūrmakrānti*
or **kūrmagati*[83]; I did not find these (or comparable) terms in the
vyākaraṇa idiom. Although obviously the procedures which Sa-paṇ seems
to intend here (one might say, three manners of the commentator's 'look-
ing at' the basic text) are not identical to the types of 'transportation' of
terms from one rule to another which I have pointed out as possible par-
allels in *vyākaraṇa,* the similarities are too striking as to be coincidental.
Note also in this connection that Sa-paṇ announces the stanza as a quota-
tion 'from a grammatical treatise' (*sgra'i-bstan-bcos-las*), so there is every
reason to assume that this terminology may in fact stem from a grammati-
cal background.

One might also recognize echos (albeit faint) of two of the character-
istic marks of a Buddha here: the eleventh of the secondary characteris-
tics (Skt. *anuvyañjana*), namely *siṃha-vikrānta-gāmin* = *seng-ge'i-stabs-
su-gshegs-pa*, 'having a lion's [only Skt.: valiant] gait'[84], and the thirtieth
of the primary characteristics, i.e. *supratiṣṭhita-pāda* = *zhabs-shin-
tu-gnas-pa*, 'having the feet well [and equally] placed'[85], which is often

---

[82] Cf. Renou (1942-2: 249), Abhyankar (1977: 298).

[83] Cf. *Mahāvyutpatti* ed. Sakaki (1916-1925: no. 4837): *kūrma* = *rus-sbal*; the other
two animals referred to here in *MJ* are listed nearby in *Mahāvyutpatti* as well, no. 4776:
siṃha = *seng-ge* and no. 4854: *maṇḍūka* = *sbal-ba* (all three sub *dud-'gro'i-skye-gnas-su-
gtogs-pa'i-ming*); cf. also no. 9349: *kūrmākṛti-khara* = *rus-sbal-gyi-rgyab-'dra-ba-rtsub-pa*.

[84] *Mahāvyutpatti*, ed. Sakaki (1916-1925: no. 279). Cf. *Bod-rgya-tshig-mdzod-chen-mo*:
Seng-ge'i-stabs-su-gshegs-pa'i-dpe-byad = *sangs-rgyas-kyi-dpe-byad-bzang-po-brgyad-
cu'i-nang-gses-shig-ste / mi-zil-gyis-gnon-pa-la-mkhas-pa-nyid-kyis-seng-ge'i-stabs-su-
gshegs-pa*. Note also *Mahāvyutpatti* no. 280: *nāga-vikrānta-gāmin* = *glang-po-che'i-stabs-
su-gshegs-pa*, no. 281: *haṃsa-vikrānta-gāmin* = *nang-pa'i-stabs-su-gshegs-pa* and no. 282:
vṛṣabha-vikrānta-gāmin = *khyu-mchog-gi-stabs-su-gshegs-pa*.

[85] *Mahāvyutpatti*, ed. Sakaki (1916-1925: no. 265).

compared to the 'firm footing of the tortoise'[86]. This, however, seems far less probable than the correlation with the above-mentioned grammatical terminology.

Sub II.10 a classification into three types of words is introduced (194v1-194v5):

(1) 'Words [generally] current in the world' (*'jig-rten-la-grags-pa('i-sgra*))
(2) 'Words [specifically] currrent in technical treatises' (*bstan-bcos-la-grags-pa('i-sgra*))
(3) 'Words [specifically] current in extraordinary [forms of verbal communication]' (*thun-mong-ma-yin-pa-la-grags-pa'i-sgra*)

In the auto-commentary Sa-paṇ explains the three categories as follows[87]:

'The first [category] are [words] that are commonly current everywhere [lit.: in all the world / among all men], such as *ka-ba* 'pillar' and *bum-pa* 'vase'. The second [category] are [words] that are current among grammarians, such as *rnam-par-dbye-ba* 'case-suffix' (Skt. *vibhakti*) and *byed-pa'i-tshig* 'syntactic-semantic relation' (Skt. *kāraka*).
Therefore [this second category of words can] be comprehended [only?] by established[88] scholars[89].
The third [category] are [words] that are not current in the world or in technical treatises.
The basis for [their] occurrence as words [and] the etymologies [for this third category of words] are difficult to expound.

---

[86] *Bod-rgya-tshig-mdzod-chen-mo*: *Rus-sbal-zhabs-kyi-mtshan-bzang = sangs-rgyas-kyi-mtshan-bzang-so-gnyis-kyi-nang-gses-shig-ste / sdom-pa-yang-dag-par-blangs-pa-la-brten-pa-nyid-kyis-rus-sbal-bzhin-du-zhabs-shin-tu-gnas-pa.*

[87] *dang-po-ni-'jig-rten-thams-cad-la-thun-mong-du-grags-pa-ka-ba-dang-bum-pa-la-sogs-pa'o // gnyis-pa-ni-sgra-pa-dag-la-grags-pa-rnam-par-dbye-ba-dang-byed-pa'i-tshig-la-sogs-pas-bsgrubs-pa-mkhas-pa-rnams-kyis-go-ba'i-brda'o // gsum-pa-ni-'jig-rten-dang-bstan-bcos-la-ma-grags-pa / sgra-'jug-pa'i-rgyu-mtshan-nges-pa'i-tshig-bshad-dka'-zhing-/ 'phags-pa'i-gang-zag-la-dgos-pa-shin-tu-che-ba / mdo-sde-dag-las-kyang-cung-zad-bshad-mod / rgyud-sde-rnams-las-mang-du-bshad-pa / de-bzhin-gshegs-pa'i-brda-zhes-grags-pa'o // 'di-rgyud-sde-bshad-pa-na-dgos-kyi-'dir-skabs-ma-yin-pas-re-zhig-bzhag-go // 'dir-skabs-su-nye-bar-dgos-pa-'jig-rten-dang-bstan-bcos-la-grags-pa'i-sgra / mkhas-pa-rnams-kyis-shes-par-bya-ba'i-tshul-cung-zad-bshad-do // de-la-'jig-rten-la-grags-pa'i-sgra-la / 'dod-rgyal-dang-rjes-'jug* [sic; = (s)grub?] *-gi-sgra-gnyis-sngar-bshad-pa-bzhin-shes-par-bya*, 194v2-194v5.

[88] I take *bsgrubs-pa* to be an adjective with *mkhas-pa*.

[89] Sa-paṇ mentions only 'grammarians' and grammatical technical terms here. It seems plausible that the technical terminology or jargon of other disciplines might be implied as well.

[These words] are of the utmost importance for the noble individuals [i.e.
Buddhas and Bodhisattvas]; they are used on a small scale in the *Sūtra*s, but
they occur frequently in the *Tantra*s; they are known as the vocabulary of
the *Tathāgata* [i.e. Buddha].

Although it is necessary [to explain] these [words] when explaining a *Tantra*,
it is not appropriate [to elaborate on this topic] here, so I will leave it for
the moment.

At this point I will [only] briefly explain what is necessary in the present
context, namely how scholars should understand the words that are current
in the world and in the technical treatises.

In this connection one should understand the words current in the world in
terms of the two [types of] word, namely the arbitrary designations (*'dod-rgyal-
gyi-sgra*) and derivative designations (*rjes-sgrub-kyi-sgra*; occasionally,
probably erroneously, *rjes-'jug-gi-sgra*), which I have discussed earlier
[namely sub I.17-19].'

It is noteworthy that this passage is quite reminiscent of a passage from
a *Guhyasamāja* commentary, in fact a set of short notes on Candrakīrti's
Pradīpoddyotanā, by Kumāra entitled *Pradīpa-dīpa-ṭippaṇī-hṛdayādarśa*[90].

As for the former two categories, the opposition *loka* lit. 'world' i.e.
'common usage in the world' vs. *śāstra* lit. 'treatise' i.e. 'usage in a tech-
nical treatise' was also well-known in indigenous Sanskrit grammar from
Mahābhāṣya onwards. In these contexts also *śāstra* is often equated with
vyākaraṇa, the technical discipline of 'grammar'. Another frequent con-
trastation was made between *loka* and the 'usage in the sacred scripture'
in casu the *Veda*[91].

The typological classification of 'arbitrary designations' and 'derivative
designations' can be found in several Indo-Tibetan linguistic sources, the
earliest of which was *Smra-sgo-mtshon-cha*, the eleventh-century treatise
by Smṛtijñānakīrti[92]. Sa-paṇ used it also in his *Sgra-la-'jug-pa*[93] which is
for the most part based on *Smra-sgo*, and he spoke of it earlier in the pres-
ent work, sub I.17-19, inter alia involving the identifications *brda = 'dod-
rgyal-gyi-sgra* and *tha-snyad = rjes-sgrub-kyi-sgra* (sub I.18, 168r4-168r5).

---

[90] The passage is translated and studied by Broido (1988: 97).
[91] Cf. Renou (1942-2: 266-267), Abhyankar (1977: 336).
[92] *Smra-sgo-mtshon-cha*, ll. 177-198, and *vṛtti* ad idem; on these texts, cf. HSGLT 2:
37-57.
[93] *Sa-skya-bka'-'bum*, *tha* f. 227r2-228r3; on this text, cf. HSGLT 2: 64-65.

We find it in works by the eighteenth-century Si-tu Paṇ-chen Chos-kyi-'byung-gnas as well[94].

The 'arbitrary designations' or 'random words' (*'dod-rgyal-gyi-sgra*), as I have stated earlier[95], amount to terms which are not grammatically analyzable, but which have an ultimately arbitrary form and are purely conventionally associated with a specific meaning. The second type of the 'derivative designation' (*rjes-sgrub-kyi-sgra*) corresponds to these terms which through linguistic analysis can be shown to derive from other lexemes or grammatical elements.

As for possible Indic antecedents for this dichotomy, the former category of the 'arbitrary designation', might be associated with the Sanskrit *yad-r̥cchā-śabda* also referring to an arbitrary term for which no analysis or etymology can be provided, usually in the sense of 'proper name' in Indic linguistics, but also in Buddhist contexts, for instance in Dignāga's *Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vr̥tti*[96].

Sa-paṇ then introduces three main techniques for word-interpretation (sub II.10, f. 194v5-196v2)[97]:

(1) 'Straightforward word-explanation' (*sgra-drang-por-bshad-pa*, 194v6-195r3)
(2) 'Explanation by means of derivation [or: etymology]' ((*sgra'i-khams-so-sor*) *drangs-nas-bshad-pa*, 195r3-195v1)
(3) 'Explanation involving permutation' (*phan-tshun-bsgyur-te-bshad-pa*, 195v1-196v2)
     Two subtypes (195v1):
     (3.1) 'permutation by means of synonyms' (*rnam-grangs-bsgyur-ba*, 195v1-195v3)
     (3.2) 'permutation of phonemes' (*yi-ge-bsgyur-ba*, 195v3-196v2)

Strictly speaking he associates these only with the second category of words, the terminology current in technical treatises[98]. However, from his examples it would appear that they can — at least also — be applied to commonly current words.

---

[94] E.g. in one of his *dris-lan* collections; cf. SIBH 1: 65-67.
[95] Cf. SIBH 1: 65-66.
[96] Cf. SIBH 1: 65-66 n. 33, and supra in paragraph (2).
[97] Cf. Jackson (1987: 195).
[98] *bstan-bcos-la-grags-pa'i-sgra-la / sgra-drang-por-bshad-pa / drangs-nas-bshad-pa / phan-tshun-bsgyur-te-bshad-pa'o*, 194v5-194v6.

As one example of (1) 'straightforward explanation', he quotes a(n uniden-
tified) *sūtra*:

> 'If one summarizes the entire Dharma, it is: If one is connected, one is
> bound, and if one is separated, one is wholly liberated.'[99]

and offers the following — indeed straightforward — explanation of the
passage:

> 'This statement is a reference to the four [Noble] Truths, namely: If one is
> connected with the cause [of suffering], one is bound by suffering, [and] if
> one is separated [from the cause of suffering] by the Path, one is wholly lib-
> erated on account of the cessation [of suffering].'[100]

Sa-paṇ offers a number of examples under the heading (2) 'explanation
by means of etymology', one of them for the Sanskrit term *kāya*. Its ety-
mology is traced to a verbal root *kai*, for which Sa-paṇ cites the phrase
kai gai rai śabde, '[The roots] *kai*, *gai* and *rai* [occur] in [the meaning]
"sound".' This can be identified as a so-called *dhātupāṭha*-entry, i.e. an
entry from a lexicon of verbal roots which forms an integral part of the
indigenous Sanskrit grammatical systems, in this case *Cāndra Dhātupāṭha*
1.266 or *Kātantra Dhātupāṭha* 1.256[101].

Here also the case of the Sanskrit term *arhat* is briefly referred to,
implicitly distinguishing between a grammatically formally correct etymo-
logy leading to the translation 'worthy of veneration' (*mchod-'os-pa*) and
what has been termed a hermeneutical etymology, which is the basis for
the rendering 'he who has defeated his enemies' (*dgra-bcom-pa*)[102]. This
dichotomy in the interpretation of the term is also expressed in the eighth-
century Indo-Tibetan lexicographical commentary *Sgra-sbyor-bam-
po-gnyis-pa* in its comments on the term *arhat*[103]. The Tibetan scholas-

---

[99] *mdo-las / chos-thams-cad-bsdu-na / 'brel-na-'ching-zhing-bral-na-rnam-par-grol*, 194v6.
[100] *zhes-gsungs-pa'i-don-bden-pa-bzhi-ston-pa'i-tshig-ste / kun-'byung-gis-'brel-na /
sdug-bsngal-gyis-'ching- / lam-gyis-bral-na / 'gog-pas-rnam-par-grol-zhes-bya-ba'i-don-to*,
194v6-195r1.
[101] Note that Sa-paṇ does not cite the Pāṇinian *Dhātupāṭha* here, which reads *kai gai
śabde* (1.965), and which, for instance, is cited in *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gnyis-pa* in its com-
ments on the term *geya*, cf. HSGLT 1: 39, HSGLT 2: 410.
[102] *arha-ta'i-sgra / dgra-bcom-pa-dang- / mchod-par-'os-pa-gnyis-ka-la-bshad-du-rung*,
195r4-195r5.
[103] Ed. Ishikawa (1990: 7-8), HSGLT 1: 21-22, SIBH 1: 69, 75.

tics refer to these two types of translation as *sgra-'gyur*, 'translation [according to] the word' and *don-'gyur*, 'translation [according to] the meaning', respectively. Elsewhere I have proposed to interpret this typology of translations as distinguishing 'convention-based translation' or 'sense-based translation', as opposed to 'intention-based translation' or 'reference-based translation'[104].

As for (3), the technique for word-interpretation involving permutation, its first subtype, 'permutation by means of synonyms', is exemplified inter alia by a very common glossing of Skt. *gata*, 'having gone' (Tib. *gshegs-pa*) as 'having understood' (Tib. *rtogs-pa*), here specifically applied to the term *Sugata*, lit. 'he who has gone well', a famous epithet of the Buddha[105]. Compare, for instance, again *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gnyis-pa* which glosses *gata* (in *Tathāgata*, another epithet of the Buddha) as 'having gone', or 'having come', or 'knowing', or 'having said'[106].

Under the heading of the second subtype, 'permutation of phonemes', Sa-paṇ offers the following observation[107]:

> 'Moreover, we find some instances where language-specialists use words in a particular manner involving the mutual exchanging of phonemes, the separation of phonemes [from one another] and the hiding [or elision] of phonemes, when they see a specific purpose [is served by this] such as for instance the countering of erroneous opinions.'

Under this subtype Sa-paṇ appears to subsume a wide range of linguistic phenomena and forms of interpretative manipulation, all of which involve some kind of changing of phonemes or syllables within the terms at hand. As one example of such manipulation — which in this case clearly transgresses the bounds of grammatical convention — Sa-paṇ

---

[104] SIBH 7, paragraph 2.2.

[105] *su-ga-ta'i-sgra / su-ni-legs-pa'am / bde-ba'am / bzang-po'am / shin-tu-la-sogs-pa-la-'jug (/) / ga-ta'i-sgra-gshegs-pa'am / rtogs-pa-la-'jug (/) / rnam-'grel-las / rgyu-spangs-yon-tan-gsum-bde-gshegs // gshegs-pa-rtogs-pa'i-don-phyir-te // des-ni-phyi-rol-pa-dang-slob / / mi-slob-pas-lhag-de-yi-phyir // zhes-gsungs-pa-lta-bu'o*, 195v1-195v3.

[106] *gata-ni-gshegs-pa'am-byon-pa'am-mkhyen-pa'am-gsungs-pa-la-bya*, ed. Ishikawa (1990: 7).

[107] *yang-skabs-'gar-log-rtog-bzlog-pa-la-sogs-pa-dgos-pa-khyad-par-can-mthong-ba'i-tshe / sgra-pa-dag-gis-yi-ge-phan-tshun-brje-ba-dang- / yi-ge-kha-phral-ba-dang- / yi-ge-mi-mngon-par-bya-ba'i-sgra'i-sbyor-ba-yod-de*, 196r1-196r2.

refers to a passage in a work[108] by Ratnākaraśānti. Here some form of identification is established between the terms *buddha* and *bhūtārtha*, apparently as some form of commentarial device[109]:

> 'According to the master Ratnākaraśānti, the term *bhūtārtha* means 'perfect meaning' [?] (*yang-dag-pa'i-don*) and he established that [term *bhūtārtha*] as a word for Buddha [or: the word "Buddha"]. By positing *bud* instead of *bhūta*, and by positing *dha* instead of *artha*, he established [the term *bhūtārtha*] as [a word for] Buddha [or: the word "Buddha"].

Another example of the 'permutation of phonemes' method, yet of a different order entirely, remaining clearly within the boundaries of grammatical convention, is the reference to the phenomenon of semantical variation in Sanskrit verbs due to the combination with various verbal prepositions (Skt. *upasarga*)[110]:

> 'Moreover, different words are formed when a single verbal root is combined with various verbal prepositions. For instance, if the single basis *māna*[111] is combined with the verbal preposition *pra-*, [the term] *pramāṇa* [meaning] 'means of valid knowledge' is formed; if combined with [the verbal preposition] *anu-*, [the term] *anumāna* [meaning] 'inference' is formed; if combined with [the verbal preposition] *upa-*, [the term *upamāna* meaning] 'analogy' is formed; if combined with [the verbal preposition] *abhi-*, [the term *abhimāna* meaning] 'self-conceit' [is formed], etc.; one should know the application [of such formations] in [their] context.

[108] Source thus far unidentified.
[109] *slob-dpon-rin-chen-'byung-gnas-zhi-bas-bhūta-artha-zhes-bya-ba-yang-dag-pa'i-don-yin / de-sangs-rgyas-kyi-sgrar-sgrub-pa-la / bhūta'i-gnas-su-bud-bzhag / artha'i-gnas-su-dha-bzhag-nas-sangs-rgyas-su-sgrub-pa*, 196r2-196r3.
[110] *yang-sgra'i-khams-gcig-la-nyer-bsgyur-gyi-rkyen-tha-dad-dang-phrad-na-sgra-du-mar-'gyur-te / mā-na-zhes-bya-ba'i-khams-gcig-la / nye-bar-sgyur-ba'i-yi-ge-pra-dang-phrad-na / pra-mā-na-tshad-mar-'gyur / a-nu-dang-phrad-na / a-nu-mā-na-rjes-dpag-tu-'gyur / u-pa-dang-phrad-na-dpe-ru-'gyur / a-bhi-dang-phrad-na-mngon-pa'i-rgyal-la-sogs-pa-skabs-dang-sbyar-shes-par-bya'o // sgra'i-bstan-bcos-las / nye-bar-bsgyur-ba'i-dbang-gis-ni // skad-byings-don-ni-rab-'gyur-te // gaṅgā'i-chu-ni-mar-mod-kyi // rgya-mtsho'i-chu-yis-'gyur-ba-bzhin // zhes-bshad-pa-ltar-ro*, 196r6-196v2.
[111] Note that when Sa-paṇ claims that a 'single basis *māna*' underlies the four forms *pramāṇa* up to *abhimāna* this is in fact incorrect, or at least an oversimplification of the facts. The first three forms (*pramāṇa*, *anumāna* and *upamāna*) are derived from the verbal root *mā*, 'to measure', with a verbal preposition (*pra-*, *anu-* and *upa-* respectively) and a primary nominal suffix *-na*, whereas *abhimāna* derives from root *man*, 'to think', with the verbal preposition *abhi-* and a primary nominal suffix *-a*.

As it is stated in a [Sanskrit] grammatical treatise:

The meaning of the verbal root can be changed by the force of the verbal preposition.
[Similarly,] although the water of the Gaṅgā [river] is sweet, [its taste] is changed by the water of the ocean.'

The verse cited at the end of the above passage is a well-known mnemotechnical stanza from the indigenous Sanskrit traditions of grammar, frequently quoted, but of unknown ultimate origin:

upasargeṇa dhātvartho balād anyatra nīyate /
gaṅgāsalilamādhuryam sāgareṇa yathāmbhasā //

This didactic verse was also current in *Mahāyāna* scholastics, as shown e.g. by its citation by Candrakīrti in the beginning of his *Prasannapadā*, specifically in his explanation of the element *pratītya* (derived from verbal root *i* with verbal preposition *prati*) in the technical term *pratītya-samutpāda*[112].

Finally, a third example which Sa-paṇ offers here is a set of two parallel verses with opposite meanings, one attributed to the evil deity Māra which begins 'The life of men is long' and a counterpoint verse, 'The life of men is not long', etc., which was spoken by the Buddha (195v4-196r1). In fact, Sa-paṇ describes the two verses as different interpretations of one and the same verse which are apparently based on the presence of a number of covert negations, i.e. instances where the Sanskrit negative prefix *a-* is indiscernible on account of a *sandhi*-combination with a preceding phoneme. I have discussed this passage elsewhere, so I will not repeat the details here[113].

Elsewhere I have pointed out the partial similarities between the three types of explanation introduced here and items in the third chapter (dealing with a set of hermeneutical issues) of the early, probably ninth-century, grammatical treatise *Gnas-brgyad-chen-mo*[114]. Moreover, comparable in particular to the third type of interpretation, involving the

---

[112] Cf. Verhagen (1988 [1996]: 42 note 115, 44-45 note 129).
[113] SIBH 4 paragraph 3.
[114] Cf. HSGLT 2: 10-11.

manipulation of phonemes, is a typology by Padma Dkar-po (1527-1592)[115] who, when discussing the interpretation of non-literal statements (*sgra-ji-bzhin-ma-yin-pa*), distinguishes three types of interpretation which involve (1) 'adding (or combining) phonemes' (*yi-ge-bsnan-pa*), (2) 'dividing phonemes' (*yi-ge-phyes-pa*) and (3) 'altering [phonemes] into different [phonemes]' (*gzhan-du-bsgyur-ba*)[116].

Two more or less isolated verses on anaphoric reference of pronouns (II.12) and the recognition of the vocative case (II.13) are followed by a section on general principles for, and various defects and problems which can occur in the transmission of teachings from teacher to pupil, in particular, of course, with regard to the interpretation of scriptural sources (II.14-21).

At this point, Sa-paṇ returns to the topic of word-interpretation proper. After a verse emphasizing the necessity of not merely comprehending the general sense of a text, but also of taking effort to understand the individual terms (II.22), the remainder of this elaborate section is for the most part concerned with the various aspects of such explication which are specifically relevant for the Tibetan scholars (II.23-30). He touches on topics such as lexicography (II.23), defects in Tibetan translations of Sanskrit terms (II.24-27), types of repetition (II.28-29), and standing expressions and aphorisms (II.30)[117].

(3.4) *Chapter 2.4: Connection*

In the fourth section of this chapter, on 'connection' (II.31-32), Sa-paṇ distinguishes two types of connection which the commentator should bring out[118]:

---

[115] In his *Dbu-ma-gzhung-lugs-gsum-gsal-bar-byed-pa-nges-don-grub-pa'i-shing-rta* and *Brjod-byed-tshig-gi-rgyud-bshad-pa-mkhas-pa'i-kha-rgyan*; cf. Broido (1984: 16, 29).

[116] Cf. Broido (1984: 16).

[117] I discuss some specific items from these sections in a separate article in the present series, viz. SIBH 7.

[118] / *sgra-dang-don-gyi-dbye-ba-yis // mtshams-sbyar-ba-ni-rnam-pa-gnyis /, MJ* II.31, 203r3. Jackson (1987: 196): "The fourth main topic was the method of explanation by linking together previous and subsequent words and topics. He explains how to do this whether the linking topics or concepts are explicitly mentioned in the basic text or not (II 31-32)."; Dreyfus (2003: 185): "(4) A commentary should also pay attention to the connection between words and topics as well as that between the different elements of the text.".

As for the [statement of] connection, there are two types, on account of the distinction between [connection of] words and [connection of] topics. (*MJ* II.31)

In his commentary he identifies the two types of connection as 'the connection of preceding and subsequent words' (*sgra-snga-phyi-mtshams-sbyar-ba*, 203r4) and 'the mutual connection of topics' (*don-phan-tshun-mtshams-sbyar-ba*, 203r4). Sa-paṇ's treatment of these two types is quite brief.

Sa-paṇ explains the first type (203r5-203r6) as 'the statement: "The meanings of the preceding and following words are connected as follows: (…)" when this [connection] cannot be readily elicited from the force of what was previously stated, namely the meanings of the words of the basic text, or, when, even if it can [be elicited from that], [the connection] is not entirely clear, or when there is a particularly difficult syntactical construction'[119]. He then quotes Dharmakīrti[120] to the effect that communication can take place on the basis of the explicit as well as the implicit[121].

The second type of connection, the statement of the connection between topics, is again subdivided into two subtypes (*MJ* II.32)[122]. The first, connection between 'brief exposé and elaborate explanation'[123] consists of 'the type of statement "After [the author of the basic text] has thus expounded [this] in a brief form, he[124] will now explain that same [topic] elaborately"'[125]. Sa-paṇ terms the second subtype the statement of 'connection by means of logical incompatibility and relation'[126]. This amounts

---

[119] *gzhung-gi-tshig-gi-don-sngar-brjod-pa'i-nus-pa-la-brten-nas-'dren-mi-nus-pa'am | gal-te-nus-kyang-dngos-su-mi-gsal-ba'am | tshig-sbyar-ba'i-tshul-dka'-ba-'ga'-zhig-tshig-snga-phyi'i-don-'di-ltar-'brel-te-zhes-brjod-pa*, 203r4-203r5.

[120] *dper-na | de-sbyar-med-kyang-brjod-'dod-las || de-yi-don-ni-rtogs-par-'gyur || zhes-gsungs-pa-ltar*, 203r5. The quote could be *Pramāṇa-vārttika* 4.191: *vivakṣāto 'prayoge 'pi tasyārtho 'yam pratīyate*, or *Pramāṇa-viniścaya* 2.10cd.

[121] *tshig-dngos-su-ma-sbyar-yang-'ga'-zhig-brjod-'dod-kyi-stobs-kyis-rtogs-pa-yang-yod | 'ga'-zhig-dngos-shugs-kyi-sgo-nas-rtogs-pa'ang-yod | 'ga'-zhig-dgos-pa'i-sgo-nas-rtogs-pa-yod-do*, 203r5-203r6.

[122] *| don-ni-mdor-bstan-rgyas-bshad-dam || 'gal-'brel-sgo-nas-mtshams-sbyar-byed |*, *MJ* II.32, 203r6.

[123] *mdor-bstan-rgyas-bshad*, in II.32, 203r6.

[124] Or I, viz. the commentator?

[125] *de-ltar-mdor-bstan-nas-de-nyid-rgyas-par-'chad-ces-pa-lta-bu*, 203r6.

[126] *'gal-'brel-sgo-nas-mtshams-sbyar*, in II.32, 203r6.

to 'statements of the type "After [the author of the basic text] has thus expounded the negative factor [lit. that which is to be eliminated], he will now expound the antidote" or "After [the author of the basic text] has expounded the cause, he will now expound the result", irrespectively whether or not [these connections] are made explicit in the basic text'[127].

The categorical distinction which Sa-paṇ makes here between the two types of connection as pertaining to 'words' (*sgra*) and 'meanings' (or 'topics', 'content'; *don*) is of course by no means so clear-cut[128]. Obviously matters of meaning and content come into play in the first type also, but equally obviously there is more emphasis on this aspect in the second type.

Perhaps the two types of 'connection' can roughly be identified as corresponding to sentence-structure, or syntactic structure, and textual structure respectively. The former appears to be restricted primarily to the correlations existing between terms within a sentence or at least within smaller textual portions (paragraphs etc.), whereas the latter seems to pertain to the identification of the topics discussed in larger segments of a text or even an entire text, and the interrelations that exist between them.

A question which indubitably merits further investigation, but which can only be briefly hinted at here, is the possible correlation between the hermeneutical methods set forth in the *Mahāyāna* literature, primarily in Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti* which is — of course in an adapted form — continued here in Sa-paṇ's *MJ*, and that of the early Buddhist traditions, specifically the *Theravāda*[129] which are primarily laid down in the paracanonical treatises *Netti-ppakaraṇa* and *Peṭakopadesa*.

Here, in Sa-paṇ's treatment of 'connection', in certain respects the exposé on 'consecutive connection' in *Netti-ppakaraṇa* comes to mind.

---

[127] *dper-na / de-ltar-spang-bya-bshad-nas-gnyen-po-'chad-ces-bya-ba'am / rgyu-bshad-nas-'bras-bu-'chad-ces-bya-ba-lta-bu-dngos-su-bkod-pa'am / gzhung-dngos-su-ma-bkod-kyang-rung*, 203v1-203v2.

[128] The identification of the *sgra / don* (Skt. *śabda / artha*) dichotomy with the 'convention' / 'intention' or 'sense' / 'reference' opposition of modern linguistics, as proposed by Broido in the eighties, which I have in turn connected with the *sgra-'gyur / don-'gyur* categorization in the context of Indo-Tibetan translations in another article on *MJ* in this series (SIBH 7), does not appear to apply here.

[129] Although some connection with the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* tradition may be supposed also, cf. Von Hinüber (1996: 80 par. 165).

This is discussed under the heading of the 'fourfold array' (Pāli *catubyūha*), the fourth of which is 'consecutive connection' (Pāli *pubbāparasandhi*). It is itself subdivided into four types[130]:

> (1) 'connection of meaning[s]' (Pāli *atthasandhi*)[131]
> (2) 'connection of word[ing]' (Pāli *byañjanasandhi*)[132]
> (3) 'connection of expounding' (Pāli *desanāsandhi*)[133]
> (4) 'connection of instruction' (Pāli *niddesasandhi*)[134]

This fourfold typology of 'connection' is reminiscent — up to a point — of the four types of 'connection' which Sa-paṇ discusses here: *atthasandhi* corresponding to *don-phan-tshun-mtshams-sbyar-ba* (sub II.31), *byañjanasandhi* to *sgra-snga-phyi-mtshams-sbyar-ba* (sub II.31); less evident, but nonetheless possibly *desanāsandhi* corresponding to the first subtype sub *don*, viz. *mdor-bstan-rgyas-bshad* (sub II.32) and *niddesasandhi* to the second subtype *'gal-'brel-sgo-nas-mtshams-sbyar* (sub II.32).

(3.5) *Chapter 2.5: Objections and Rebuttals*.

The fifth, final section of the second chapter of *MJ*, still following the basic structure provided by *Vyākhyāyukti*, is devoted to the method or perhaps rather the aspect of the commentary consisting in discourse in the form of a debate, or as both Vasubandhu and Sa-paṇ term it, 'the objections and [their] rebuttals' (Skt. *codya-parihāra*, Tib. *brgal-lan*). It is indeed extremely common in classical Indic commentaries, both Buddhist and non-Buddhist, to find the form of a debate or discussion between various parties, usually a beginner or pupil representing the so-called

---

[130] Hardy (ed.) (1902: 3, 38-39), Ñāṇamoli (1962: xxxviii, 9, 55-64); cf. also *Peṭakopadesa*, Ñāṇamoli (1964: 123-124). Cf. also commentary ad *Nettippakaraṇa*, ed. Hardy (1902: 202): *Pubbāparānusandhī ti pubbena ca aparena ca anusandhi. Pubbāparena sandhī ti pi pātho. Suttassa pubbabhāgena aparabhāgaṃ saṃsandetvā kathanan ti attho. Saṃgītivasena vā pubbāparabhūtehi suttantarehi saṃvaṇṇiyamānassa suttassa saṃsandanaṃ pubbāparānusandhi. Yaṃ pubbapadena parapadassa sambandhanaṃ, ayaṃ pi pubbāparasandhi.*

[131] Ñāṇamoli (1962: xxxviii, 62): "meaning-sequence".

[132] Ñāṇamoli (1962: xxxviii, 62): "phrasing-sequence".

[133] Ñāṇamoli (1962: xxxviii, 62-63): "teaching-sequence".

[134] Ñāṇamoli (1962: xxxviii, 63-64): "demonstration-sequence".

pūrvapakṣa, 'preliminary position', and the teacher, or author of the commentary, representing the *siddhānta*, 'established conclusion'[135].

This fifth section is, again, very brief and does not give any comprehensive treatment or general survey of the topic it addresses; perhaps because the subject is treated at length in the next, third chapter of *MJ*, which is devoted to the theory and practice of debating[136]. It opens with a brief introduction on the importance of basing one's arguments both on 'scripture' (Skt. *āgama*, Tib. *lung*) as well as on 'logical reasoning' (Skt. *yukti*, Tib. *rigs-pa*), regardless whether one is facing non-Buddhist objections or critique stemming from fellow Buddhists belonging to the various early, *Mahāyāna*, or Tantric traditions[137]. For the most part the section consists of a slightly more elaborate exposé of the 'six alternatives' (Skt. *ṣaṭkoṭi*, Tib. *mtha'-drug*, lit. 'six extremes' or 'six limits')[138], a set of three alternative pairs of properties that play a role in scriptural interpretation[139]. In his commentary ad II.34 Sa-paṇ lists the six as follows:

> (1) *dgongs-pa*(*-bshad-pa*), '(communicated) with [particular] intention' (*MJ* 203v6-204r2)

---

[135] Jackson (1987: 196): "Then he treated the fifth main topic, the method of commenting on a thorny doctrinal question by means of objections and replies, i.e. through a presentation that mirrors the exchange of views of participants in a discussion."; Dreyfus (2003: 185): "(5) Finally, it [Verhagen: a commentary] should examine possible objections and articulate answers in a way that reflects the actual practice of debate.".

[136] Text and annotated translation of this third chapter is, as mentioned supra, available in Jackson (1987).

[137] Sub II.33: / *brgal-lan-sgo-nas-gzhung-gi-don* // *lung-dang-rigs-pas-gtan-la-dbab* /, 203v2.

[138] Other translations for the term *mtha'-drug*: Thurman (1988: 137, 147 n. 24): "the six parameters", Arènes (2002B: passim): "Six extrêmes (ou possibilités alternatives)".

[139] Sub II.34: / *mtha'-drug-gang-gis-shes-pa-de* // *gzhung-bshad-pa-la-shin-tu-mkhas* /, 203v5-203v6. In the topical outline (*sa-bcad*) of *MJ* based on Glo-bo Mkhan-chen's commentary reproduced in Jackson (1987) appendix I, this exposé of the 'six alternatives' is not identified as part of the section on 'objections and rebuttals', but as a second main section of the second chapter, dealing with a second major method of scriptural interpretation ((B) *mtha'-drug-gi-bshad-pa*) next to the fivefold system based on Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti* ((A) *rnam-bshad-rigs-pa-las-gsungs-pa-ltar-'chad-thabs-lngas-bshad-pa*). However, this passage which *follows* the treatment of the *mtha'-drug* in *MJ* seems to indicate that it *does* form part of the *brgal-lan* section: *mtha'-drug-gi-tshul-rgyas-par-gzhan-du-shes-par-bya'o* // *'di-lta-bu'i-bshad-pa'i-tshul-legs-par-shes-na* / *mdo-rgyud-kyi-dgos-pa-legs-par-shes-shing-* / *brgal-lan-gyis-gtan-la-'debs-pa-mkhas-par-'gyur-ro* // *brgal-lan-gyi-tshul-'di-legs-par-shes-par-'dod-na* / *rigs-pa'i-gter-du-blta-bar-bya'o*, 204v4-204v5.

(2) *dgongs-pa-ma-yin-pa*(-*bshad-pa*), '(communicated) without [particular] intention' (*MJ* 204r2)[140]

(3) *drang-ba'i-don,* 'provisional meaning' (*MJ* 204r3)

(4) *nges-pa'i-don,* 'definitive meaning' (*MJ* 204r3-204v1)

(5) *sgra-ji-bzhin-pa,* 'literal [statement]' (*MJ* 204v1-204v2)

(6) *sgra-ji-bzhin-ma-yin-pa,* 'non-literal [statement]' (*MJ* 204v2-204v3)

This set of six 'alternatives' is usually found in Tantric contexts. It should be noted that this ṣaṭkoṭi in Tantric hermeneutics is often incorporated into larger complexes of exegetical categories, most notably the system of the so-called 'seven ornaments' (Skt. *saptālaṃkāra*, Tib. *rgyan-bdun*)[141]. It would take us too far afield to go into more detail at this point.

Within the Sanskrit traditions the set of 'six alternatives' appears to be attested only in Tantric literature[142]. In the Tibetan context it is also predominantly represented in Tantric exegesis[143], but in Tibetan Buddhism their application sometimes is extended to exoteric, *Sūtra,* scripture also. The earliest Tibetan scholastic to do so appears to have been Sa-paṇ. Here, in the second chapter of *MJ* as well as in the third chapter, sub verse 23[144], he applies this set to non-Tantric Buddha-Word as well[145]. A later example is the famous *'Brug-pa Bka'-brgyud-pa* scholar Padma-dkar-po (1527-1592), who did the same in his *Dbu-ma-gzhung-lugs-gsum-gsal-bar-byed-pa-nges-don-grub-pa'i-shing-rta*[146].

[140] Here in *MJ* as well as in Padma-dkar-po's *Dbu-ma-gzhung-lugs-gsum-gsal-bar-byed-pa-nges-don-grub-pa'i-shing-rta* (cf. infra) there is a slight difference in terms with Tantric usage for the first two: *dgongs-bshad* and *dgongs-min* in Tantric context = *dgongs-pa-can* and *dgons-pa-can-ma-yin-pa* here, cf. Ruegg (1985: 322 n. 10).

[141] Cf. e.g. Steinkellner (1978: 449-453), Broido (1983: 34-44), Arènes (2002A), (2002B: 5-12), (2003).

[142] Important Indic sources are e.g. Candrakīrti's *Pradīpoddyotanā* commentary on *Guhyasamājatantra*, cf. Steinkellner (1978: 450-453), and Śraddhākaravarman's **Jñānava-jrasamuccaya-nāmatantrodbhava-saptālaṃkāravimocana* preserved in Tibetan translation under the title *Ye-shes-rdo-rje-kun-las-btus-pa'i-rgyud-las-'byung-ba'i-rgyan-bdun-rnam-par-dgrol-ba*, cf. Arènes (2002A: 170-171, 181).

[143] The set of six 'alternatives' as discussed by various Tibetan Tantric exegetes following *Pradīpoddyotanā* is studied by Broido (1983B: 21-23, 33-40) and (1984: 9-21, 25-26); for the treatment of this set in Dbal-mang Dkon-mchog-rgyal-mtshan's *Rgyud-sde-bzhi'i-don-rnam-par-bzhag-pa-sngags-pa'i-'jug-pa'i-sgo*, cf. Arènes (2003: 22-25, 37, 39-42) and in Bdud-'joms 'Jigs-'bral-ye-shes-rdo-rje's *Snga-'gyur-rnying-ma-pa'i-rnam-gzhag-legs-bshad-snang-ba'i-dga'-ston*, cf. Arènes (2002B: 6-29).

[144] Cf. Jackson (1987: 335, 385 n. 56).

[145] Cf. Ruegg (1985: 310), Arènes (2002B: 8).

[146] Cf. Broido (1984: 11-21, 25-26), Ruegg (1985: 310, 322 n. 10).

It is certainly conceivable that (elements in) this set of 'six alternatives' and other hermeneutical categories with which they are often associated may have circulated in Indic non-Tantric milieus contemporaneous with or prior to their appearance in Tantristic exegetical practice, as Arènes has speculated recently[147]. This applies in particular to the three sets of opposites brought together in the *ṣaṭkoṭi* which are known as separate dichotomies (i.e. not integrated as a set of six) in non-Tantric Buddhism, albeit not per se with the same function or meaning[148]. Most notably this is the case for the *nītārtha / neyārtha* (Tib. *nges-pa'i-don / drang-ba'i-don*) pair which is attested in early Buddhism as well as in (relatively early) *Mahāyāna* sources as a pivotal set of hermeneutical criteria[149]. It is significant, in any case, that influential Tibetan scholastic authorities such as Sa-paṇ and Padma-dkar-po did not hesitate to use the system of the 'six alternatives' in their interpretation of *Sūtra* scripture.

In his comments Sa-paṇ associates the first 'alternative' in his list with the four types of 'intention' (Skt. *abhiprāya*, Tib. *dgongs-pa*) and the four types of 'allusion' (Skt. *abhisaṃdhi*, Tib. *ldem-dgongs*)[150] and he refers to *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* as a source for further information on this topic[151]. In his treatment of the fourth 'alternative' the author refers to *Saṃdhinir-mocanasūtra* for the same purpose[152]. Sa-paṇ concludes the section on the 'six alternatives' with a statement which again shows that our author indeed applies these hermeneutical categories to *Sūtra*s and *Tantra*s alike, adding a quotation from the *Pradīpoddyotanā* by (the Tantristic author) Candrakīrti[153]:

[147] Arènes (2002B: 29-37); cf. also Steinkellner (1978: 449, 451-452).
[148] Cf. Steinkellner (1978: 451-452), Arènes (2002B: 8).
[149] Cf. Lamotte (1949: 349-359) = (1988: 16-23), Broido (1983B: 21), (1988: 72), SIBH 2: 123-130.
[150] On *abhiprāya* and *abhisaṃdhi*, cf. e.g. Broido (1984), (1985), Ruegg (1985), (1989).
[151] *'di-dag-rgyas-par-yi-ge-mangs-kyis-dgos-pas-ma-bris-te / mdo-sde-rgyan-la-sogs-par-blta-bar-bya'o*, 204r1-204r2. A *locus classicus* for these categories is indeed *Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṃkāra* which at 12.16-18 introduces the four types of *abhisaṃdhi* (16-17) and the four types of *abhiprāya* (18), ed. Bagchi (1970: 80), cf. e.g. Broido (1984: 1, 23-24), Ruegg (1985: 310).
[152] *'di-dag-rgyas-par-dgongs-'grel-la-sogs-par-shes-par-bya'o*, 204r4; the *Saṃdhinir-mocana* indeed being a classical source for the categorization at hand here, viz. the *nītārtha / neyārtha* opposition, which it discusses e.g. in 7.30 and 7.32 (also *abhiprāya* in 10.11 and [*abhi-*]*saṃdhi* in 7.29, 8.24 and 10.8).
[153] *mtha'-drug-mi-shes-na-mdo-rgyud-gang-bshad-kyang-nor-bar-'gyur-te / slob-dpon-zla-ba-grags-pas / mtha'-drug-bral-bas-nges-par-rtogs-zhes-gang-smra-ba // zla-ba-lta-*

> If one does not know the 'six alternatives', whatever *Sūtra* or *Tantra* one is
> explaining, errors will occur, as is stated by master Candrakīrti:
>
>> "One who claims to have an unerring understanding [of the scripture]
>> without [applying] the 'six alternatives',
>> is like one who desires to look at the moon, [but] looks [only] at the
>> fingertip [pointing to the moon]."

The simile of looking solely at the pointing finger and not at that which
the finger points at, especially in the context of the hermeneutical discourse
we have here, is of course reminiscent of the well-known passage in the
Laṅkāvatārasūtra, where the Buddha speaks about the distinction between
word and meaning, comparing a word to a pointing finger and its mean-
ing to what the finger points out, warning his disciples not to stare only
at the finger (i.e. the word) and thereby fail to see that which it is point-
ing at (i.e. its meaning) and, so to speak, miss the point[154].

Finally, at the very end of the section on 'objections and rebuttals' Sa-
paṇ also refers to his own major work on logic, the *Tshad-ma-rigs-pa'i-
gter* for further reading on this topic[155].

(4) Concluding Observations

Sa-paṇ's *MJ* has proven to be an eminently important source of infor-
mation on the early foundations of Tibetan scholasticism, a feature inex-
tricably linked with the monastically organized forms of Buddhism which
were to become dominant in Tibet from the twelfth century onwards. Its
three chapters are devoted to a triad later to become classical in Tibetan
scholastics, namely 'composition', 'exposition' and 'debate' respectively.
The ideal of *pāṇḍitya*, of scholarly excellence based on the classical Indian
models, which Sa-paṇ sets forth in *MJ* and elsewhere in his *œuvre*, involves
a wide range of scholastical disciplines. This is particularly highlighted
by the truly impressive listing of classical Indian sources for his work, enu-
merated under twelve genres, which Sa-paṇ offers at the outset of *MJ*.

'dod-sor-mo'i-rtse-la-lta-dang-mtshungs // zhes-gsungs-pa-ltar-ro, 204v3-204v4; cf. Arènes
(2003: 16).

[154] Ed. Nanjio (1956: 196), cf. Lamotte (1949: 347-348) = (1988: 15).

[155] *brgal-lan-gyi-tshul-'di-legs-par-shes-par-'dod-na / rigs-pa'i-gter-du-blta-bar-bya'o*,
204v5.

In the present article I have focussed in particular on matters of hermeneutics in the first two chapters. There we find notions on language and scriptural interpretation stemming from *Abhidharma* and *Mahāyāna* literature, from Buddhist epistemology (Dignāga and Dharmakīrti being referred to explicitly) and from Sanskrit indigenous grammar. The second chapter of *MJ* was based on the structural scheme of Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*, which distinguishes five exegetical categories, viz. 'intention', 'summary', 'meaning of the words', 'connection' and 'objections and rebuttals'. *MJ* does not follow *Vyākhyāyukti* all too closely; Sa-paṇ often deals with the five categories more or less in his own way, in part no doubt due to the fact that Sa-paṇ was introducing a Tibetan readership to a non-indigenous originally Indian literature, whereas Vasubandhu was addressing an Indian audience. We have seen that a considerable variety of grammatical and interpretational notions and devices pass under review here, involving forms of exegesis which are particular to Sūtric as well as Tantric literatures.

ABBREVIATIONS

Bod-rgya-tshig-mdzod-chen-mo	=	Zhang Yisun (1985).
HSGLT 1	=	Verhagen (1994)
HSGLT 2	=	Verhagen (2001A)
MJ	=	*Mkhas-pa-'jug-pa'i-sgo*
Sa-paṇ	=	Sa-skya Paṇḍita Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan (1182-1251)
SIBH 1	=	Verhagen (2001B)
SIBH 2	=	Verhagen (2001C)
SIBH 3	=	Verhagen (2002)
SIBH 4	=	Verhagen (forthcoming A)
SIBH 7	=	Verhagen (forthcoming B)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abhyankar, K.V. (& Shukla, J.M.) (1977). *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, second revised edition (1: 1961), Baroda. (= Gaekwad's Oriental Series 134)

Arènes, P. (2002A). 'Herméneutique des *Tantra*: Le *Ye shes rdo rje kun las btus pa'i rgyud las 'byung ba'i rgyan bdun rnam par dgrol ba* de Śraddhā-karavarman', in: H. Blezer (ed.), *Religion and Secular Culture. Tibetan*

Studies II. PIATS 2000: Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000, Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill, 2002, (= Brill's Tibetan Studies Library 2/2), 163-183.

Arènes, P. (2002B). 'Herméneutique des *Tantra*: les "Six extrêmes (ou possibilités alternatives)" (*ṣaṭkoṭi*; *mtha' drug*). A propos d'un exemple de prégnance des modèles exégétiques des *sūtra*', *Revue d'Études Tibétaines* 1, 4-43.

Arènes, P. (2003). 'De l'utilité de l'herméneutique des *Tantra* Bouddhiques à propos d'un exposé de l'appareil des "Sept Ornements" par un doxologue érudit *Dge lugs pa* Dbal mang Dkon mchog rgyal mtshan (1764-1863)', *Revue d'Études Tibétaines* 4, 4-60.

Bacot, J. (1957). *Zugiñima, Texte et Traduction*, 2 vols., Paris.

Bagchi, S. (ed.) (1970). *Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṃkāra of Asaṅga*, Darbhanga. (= Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 1.3)

Bosson, J.E. (1969). *A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels. The Subhāṣitaratnanidhi of Sa Skya Paṇḍita in Tibetan and Mongolian*, Bloomington — The Hague. (= Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series, 92)

Broido, M. (1983A). 'A note on *dgos-'brel*', *Journal of the Tibet Society* 3, 5-19.

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

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

Broido, M. (1985). 'Intention and Suggestion in the *Abhidharmakośa*: Sandhā-bhāṣā Revisited', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 13, 327-381.

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

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

Dreyfus, G.B.J. (1997). *Recognizing Reality. Dharmakīrti's Philosophy and Its Tibetan Interpretations*, Albany: State University of New York Press. (= SUNY Series in Buddhist Studies)

Dreyfus, G.B.J. (2003). *The Sound of Two Hands Clapping. The Education of a Tibetan Buddhist Monk*, Bekeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press.

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

Eimer, H. (1983) [C]. *Rab tu 'byuṅ ba'i gzhi. Die tibetische Übersetzung des Pravrajyāvastu im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins,* 2 vols., Wiesbaden. (= Asiatische Forschungen 82)

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

Hahn, M. (1981). 'Zu einer Neuedition von Harṣadevas Nāgānanda', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 25, 131-137.

Hahn, M., Steiner, R. & Ghoṣa, M.C. (1991). *The Recensions of the Nāgānanda by Harṣadeva. Vol. 1: The North Indian Recension*, Edited by Mādhava Candra Ghoṣa assisted by Kṛṣṇa Kamala Bhaṭṭācārya. With a general introduction by M. Hahn, and a preface and a bibliography of the editions and translations of the Nāgānanda by R. Steiner, New Delhi.

Hardy, E. (ed.) (1902). *The Netti-pakaraṇa with Extracts from Dhammapāla's Commentary*, London: Pali Text Society.

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)

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

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

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

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

Kapstein, M. (2003). 'The Indian Literary Identity in Tibet', in: S. Pollock (ed.), *Literary Cultures in History. Reconstructions from South Asia*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press, 747-802.

Khetsun Sangpo [Mkhas-btsun-bzang-po] (1973-1980). *Biographical Dictionary of Tibet and Tibetan Buddhism*, 11 vols, Dharamsala.

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), 393-410.

Lamotte, E. (1949). 'La critique d'interprétation dans le bouddhisme', *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*, 9, Mélanges Grégoire, (Bruxelles), 341-361. English translation of Lamotte (1949):

[Boin-Webb, S. (tr.)] 'The Assessment of Textual Interpretation in Buddhism', in: Lopez, D.S., jr. (ed.) (1988). *Buddhist Hermeneutics*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 11-27.

Miller, R.A. (1993). *Prolegomena to the first two Tibetan grammatical treatises*, Wien. (= Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 30).

Ñāṇamoli (trl.) (1962). *The Guide (Netti-ppakaraṇaṃ) According to Kaccāna Thera Translated from the Pali by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli*, London (= Pali Text Society, Translation Series 33).

Ñāṇamoli (trl.) (1964). *The Piṭaka-Disclosure (Peṭakopadesa) According to Kaccāna Thera Translated from the Pali by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli*, London (= Pali Text Society, Translation Series 35).

Nanjio, B. (ed.) (1923; repr. 1956). *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, Kyoto

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

Newman, J. (1998). 'Islam in the Kālacakra Tantra', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 21.2.

Renou, L. (1940). *La Durghaṭavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva, traité grammatical en sanskrit du xiie siècle, édité et traduit. Volume 1, fascicule I: Introduction*, Paris. (Collection Emile Senart 6)

Renou, L. (1942). *Terminologie grammaticale du Sanskrit*, 3 vols., Paris. (= Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Sciences Historiques et Philologiques 280-282) [Reprint in 1 vol.: Paris, 1957]

Ruegg, D.S. (1985) & (1988). 'Purport, implicature and presupposition: Sanskrit abhiprāya and Tibetan dgoṅs pa/dgoṅs gzhi as hermeneutical concepts', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 13, 309-325 & *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 16, 1-4.

Ruegg, D.S. (1989). 'Allusiveness and Obliqueness in Buddhist Texts: *saṃdhā*, *saṃdhi*, *saṃdhyā* and *abhisaṃdhi*', in: C. Caillat (ed.), *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, Paris, 295-328.

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

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

Smith, E.G. (2001). *Among Tibetan Texts. History and Literature of the Himalayan Plateau*, Boston: Wisdom Publications (Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism).

Steinkellner, E. (1978). 'Remarks on Tantristic Hermeneutics', in: Ligeti, L. (ed.) (1978), *Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös Memorial Symposium held at Matrafüred, Hungary 24-30 September 1976*, Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 445-458.

Tachikawa, M. (1983). *A Catalogue of the United States Library of Congress Collection of Tibetan Literature in Microfiche*, Tokyo. (= Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series Maior III)

Thurman, R.A.F. (1988). 'Vajra Hermeneutics', in: Lopez, D.S., jr. (ed.) (1988). *Buddhist Hermeneutics*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 119-148.

Tillemans, T.J.F. (1999). *Scripture, Logic, Language. Essays on Dharmakīrti and his Tibetan Successors*, Boston: Wisdom Publications. (= Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism)

Tucci, G. (1949). *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, 3 vols., Roma.

Vasu, Ś.C. (ed., trl.) (1891). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini, edited and translated into English*, 2 vols., Allahabad. (repr. Delhi 1962)

Verhagen, P.C. (1988). 'Tibetan Expertise in Sanskrit Grammar – a Case Study: Grammatical Analysis of the Term *Pratītya-samutpāda*', *Journal of the Tibet Society*, 8, 1988 [1996], 21-48.

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

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

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

Verhagen, P.C. (2001C) 'Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (2): Notes Apropos to the Role of Hermeneutics in Buddhist Sectarianism in India and Tibet', *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies 2 (Special Issue including Proceedings of the Colloquium on "Buddhism: Schools and Sects" held at the Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium) on May 26-27, 2000)*, 121-134.

Verhagen, P.C. (2002). 'Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (3): Grammatical Models in Buddhist Formulas', in: H. Blezer (ed.), *Religion and Secular Culture. Tibetan Studies II. PIATS 2000: Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000*, Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill (= Brill's Tibetan Studies Library 2/2), 143-161.

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

Verhagen, P.C. (forthcoming B). 'Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (7): Sa-skya Paṇḍita's *Mkhas-'jug* on the Sanskrit-Tibetan Interface: Synthesis, Comparison and Translation', in: Proceedings of the 10th Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies (Oxford 2003).

Vogel, C. (1965). *Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā. The first five chapters of its Tibetan version. Edited and rendered into English with the original Sanskrit. Accompanied by a literary introduction and a running commentary on the Tibetan translating-technique*, Wiesbaden. (= Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XXXVII,2)

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

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

Zhang Yisun (1985). *Bod-rgya-tshig-mdzod-chen-mo (Zang Han Da Cidian)*, Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.