STUDIES IN INDO-TIBETAN BUDDHIST HERMENEUTICS (5)  
THE MKHAS-PA-RNAMS-'JUG-PA'I-SGO BY SA-SKYA PANḌITA KUN-DGA’-RGYAL-MTSHAN¹.  

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 Vyākhya-yukti by the Indian scholar Vasubandhu (circa fourth/fifth century). The present article will focus on a work closely related to Vyākhya-yukti 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).  
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-panḍ 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-paṅ)⁴. This nomer clearly signalizes his preeminence not only as a religious expert but also as a scholastic specialist; Sa-paṅ is in fact considered as one of the founding masters of the scholastic traditions in the classical Tibetan Buddhist culture⁵.

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 1220-1230⁷. Recently Kapstein has argued that Sa-paṅ, in his MJ, has formulated a scholarly ideal that he has based directly on the classical Indian notions of scholastical excellence, of pāṇḍitya⁸.

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-bcos⁹. 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-byakun-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-pan 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.


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-pan 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).


\(^{17}\) 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.

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

1. vyāñjana-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.

Sa-paṅ 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-c)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

their turn form the basis for the derivation of the third level of the bound syntactic word forms. Sa-pa 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-pa 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-pa introduces a quote from Dignāga which has thus far unfortunately defied identification.

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:

1. nyācchā-śabda, ‘arbitrary words’ i.e. proper nouns (nyācchāśabdeṣu nāṁmā viśiṣṭo ‘ṛtha ucyate dhīthā 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 kriyāyā pācaka iti)
5. dravya-śabda, ‘substance-words’ i.e. [another type? of] nouns (dravya-śabdeṣu dravyeṇa daṇḍī viśāṇīti)

In this section Sa-pa 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

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-pratīṣedha*, 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 readership 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 Dharmakīrti’s *Pramāṇavārttika*\(^{29}\); some extremely summary statements about the verb in Sanskrit (I.50) and, finally, a definition of a sentence according 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 Dāṇḍin’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 particular 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 affirmation (170v5), and, in connection with the types of negation, referring generally to ‘grammatical 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-paṅ also quotes a definition from *Amarakośa* in the auto-commentary: *a-ma-ra-ko-śā-las / sup-dang-ti-nga’i-mtha’-can-nag / 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: *su-piN-antam padam*, ‘[An element] ending in a nominal case-ending (*suP*) or in a verbal personal ending (*tiN*) is [technically termed] a bound, syntactic word form (*pada*)’. Note that the Tibetan translation *ngag* for Sanskrit *pada* is not the standard renderring, which would be *tshig*.  

Note that the Tibetan translation *ngag* for Sanskrit *pada* is not the standard renderring, which would be *tshig*. 


literature scholars have occupied themselves with this text. This partial translation by Sa-pan 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.

In the section on grammar, Sa-pan deals primarily with Sanskrit grammar, 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’, but that he has based this MJ compendium on his careful ‘study and investigation’ of the ‘most famous and widespread’ 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:

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


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.


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.

rang-bzo-dang-mun-sprul, 165r1.
yongs-su-grags-pa-phal-che-ba, 165r1.

This passage is also translated and discussed in Kapstein (2003: 778-780).
sgra’i-bstan-bcos-ka-lā-pa-dang- / tsandra-pa-la-sogs-pa, 164v2; for this literature, cf. HSGLT 1.
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.’

(4) ‘The treatises on metrics (Chando-)Ratnākara and Sdeb-sbyor-gyi-tshoms etc.’

(5) ‘The treatise on the poetical figures [by] Daṇḍī[ṇ] [i.e. Kāvyādarśa] and the Sarvasvatīkāṇṭhābharaṇa etc.’

(6) ‘The lexicographical works Amarakośa and Viśvaprakāśa etc.’

(7) ‘The dramaturgical works [lit. treatises] Nāgānanda and *Rūpamaṇjarī etc.’


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 Kaśyapa, beginning with Kumārasambhava”. 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 (Abhijñāsakuntalā, Mālavikāgniṃitra and Vikramorvaṣi) and four poems (three being the most famous, scil. Kumārasambhava, Raghuvanśa 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 Jñānasrīmitra’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-dan-dāi-dang- / dbyangs-can-gyi-mgul-rgyan-la-sogs-pa, 164v3. On the former work, first introduced in Tibetan scholastics by Sa-pa in the present work, cf. supra. The latter is probably the well known treatise on poetics, attributed to Bhojadeva(eva) (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.


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

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

(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.’

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

(12) ‘Within Buddhism, the three *Piṭakas* 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, etc.’

One should probably regard this statement of Sa-pa’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”.


48 *nang-pa-dang-phyi-rol-pa’i-byre-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 *Viṣvalocana* 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 *Piṭakas* and the four *Tantra*-classes; or, far less probably, on all the treatises mentioned above?

of scholarship (Skt. pāṇḍītya) derived from the classical Indic culture which he set forth with great self-confidence but also with full appreciation 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\(^5^1\).

This type of testimonium of sources at the outset of a technical treatise 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 Pañ-chen Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan (1292-1376)\(^5^2\) and the Čāndra commentary by Si-tu Pañ-chen Chos-kyi-'byung-gnas (1699?-1774)\(^5^3\).

(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 doctrinal 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\(^5^4\).

1. ‘Intention’, ‘purpose’ (Skt. prayojana, Tib. dgos-pa): sub II.3, f. 191r5-191r6
2. ‘Summarized meaning’ (Skt. pīṇḍārtha, 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

\(^{52}\) Cf. HSGLT 2: 93-94.
\(^{53}\) Cf. HSGLT 2: 172-179.
The body of the chapter, i.e. the treatment of the above five categories is preceded by brief discussions of the required properties of the teacher (II.2a), the student (II.2b) and the doctrine (II.2c) and the interaction between these three (II.3).

(3.1) Chapter 2.1: Intention

For the first category, ‘purpose’ or ‘intention’, Sa-pa merely states that this point is well known and does not need any further expatiation. 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. There he had introduced a quotation from Vasubandhu’s Vyākhyaḥukti:

“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-byā), (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”.

---

57 Jackson (1987: 195): “The first of these Sa-pa 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.”.
59 On dgos-’brel in general, cf. e.g. Broido (1983).
Chapter 2.2: Summary.

In the brief section on the second category, the ‘summary’ or ‘summarized meaning’, Sa-pan 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-pan 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-pan 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).

\(^{62}\) gzung-don-so-so’i-bsdus-don (191r6), gzung-lugs-so-so’i-bsdus-don (191v2), bye-brag-gi-bsdus-don (191v3).


‘Taking into consideration the entire basic text, from the beginning to the end, one should establish the main general sections\textsuperscript{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-paṅ the summary had actually even developed into a separate genre of commentary, starting from the numerous ‘Summary’ (\textit{bsdus-don}) type of commentaries written by Rngog-lo-tsā-ba Blo-lсан-shes-rab (1059-1109)\textsuperscript{67}.

Elsewhere\textsuperscript{68} I have looked at the possibility that the second type of summary which Sa-paṅ discusses here can be identified as the well-known \textit{sa-bcad} or ‘topical outline’ device, which is widely used throughout the Tibetan commentary literature. The origin of this \textit{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-paṅ is not reflecting merely Indian models and ideals of scholastics, but also Chinese.

(3.3) \textit{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 (\textit{ngag-gi-don-bshad, 192v2})\textsuperscript{69}:


\textsuperscript{67} Cf. e.g. Dreyfus (2003: 137).

\textsuperscript{68} SIBH 7, paragraph 3.

\textsuperscript{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)\textsuperscript{70}
(2) ‘Explanation of words’ proper (perhaps rather ‘the individual explanation of words’ (?), tshig-rnam-par-bshad-pa’i-tshul, 192v3)\textsuperscript{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-pa himself\textsuperscript{72} and to Smra-sgo-mtshon-cha by Smrtijñänakīrti, etc\textsuperscript{73}.

The latter, far broader topic is elaborated on in the remainder of this section (II.8-30; 192v5-203r3). First Sa-pa addresses elementary sentence analysis, offering a brief partial treatment of the kārakas, the system of syntactic-semantic relations in indigenous Sanskrit grammar\textsuperscript{74} (II.8-9), this only ‘as far as required for Tibetans’\textsuperscript{75}. He then applies this to three sample passages, viz. from Nāgārjuna’s Mūla-madhyamaka-kārikā (193r3-193v3), from Haribhadra’s Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka (193v3-193v6), and from the Vajra-vidāraṇa-dhāranī (193v6-194r4). Note that earlier in the text, Sa-pa had already touched on the topic of the kārakas 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\textsuperscript{76}:

\textsuperscript{70} Note that a possible translation for tshig-gi-sbyor-ba would be ‘formation of words’; taking into consideration that Sa-pa 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.

\textsuperscript{71} Cf. Jackson (1987: 195): “the method of commenting word-by-word”.

\textsuperscript{72} kho-bos-byas-pa’i-sgra’i-bstan-bcos-gzhan, 192v4-192v5; Sa-pa 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.

\textsuperscript{73} smra-sgo-la-sogs-par-hlta-bar-byao’, 192v5; Smra-sgo deals with samāsa in verses 235-315; on Smra-sgo in general, cf. HSGLT 2: 37-53.

\textsuperscript{74} On this system, cf. e.g. HSGLT 2: 278-284.

\textsuperscript{75} ‘dir-bod-la-nye-bar-mkho-ba’i-bshad-tshul-cung-zad-brjod-par-byao, 193r1.

“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-seeing 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 jumping 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 grammar77, 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 preceding 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 one81.

77 In his draft translation of this chapter Jackson had already identified the two possible antecedents in Sanskrit vyākaraṇa terminology.
79 Cf. Renou (1942-1: 46-47), Abhyankar (1977: 32, s.v. apakarṣa (ii)).
80 Vasu (1891-1: 503).
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’. 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 somewhat 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 *kūrmakṛānti or *kūrmagati; I did not find these (or comparable) terms in the vyākaraṇa idiom. Although obviously the procedures which Sa-pa seems to intend here (one might say, three manners of the commentator’s ‘looking 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 parallels in vyākaraṇa, the similarities are too striking as to be coincidental. Note also in this connection that Sa-pa announces the stanza as a quotation ‘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 grammatical background.

One might also recognize echos (albeit faint) of two of the characteristic marks of a Buddha here: the eleventh of the secondary characteristics (Skt. anuvyañjana), namely simha-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

---

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: simha = 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: kūrmākrit-khara = rus-sbal-gyi-rgyab’dra-ba-rtsub-pa.
compared to the ‘firm footing of the tortoise’\textsuperscript{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-rt-en-la-grags-pa’i-sgra)
(2) ‘Words [specifically] current 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-pan explains the three categories as follows\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{88} scholars\textsuperscript{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.


\textsuperscript{88} I take bsgrubs-pa to be an adjective with mkhas-pa.

\textsuperscript{89} Sa-pan 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. Buddhhas and Bodhisattvas]; they are used on a small scale in the Sūtras, but they occur frequently in the Tantra; 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 Pradīpā-dīpa-tippanī-hṛdayādāraśā.

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 technical treatise’ was also well-known in indigenous Sanskrit grammar from Mahābhāṣya onwards. In these contexts also śāstra is often equated with vīyākaraṇa, the technical discipline of ‘grammar’. Another frequent contrastation was made between loka and the ‘usage in the sacred scripture’ in casu the Veda.

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 Śrītijñānakīrti. Sa-paṅ used it also in his Sgra-la-'jug-pa which is for the most part based on Smra-sgo, and he spoke of it earlier in the present work, sub I.17-19, inter alia involving the identifications brda = 'dodrgyal-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).
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 Pañ-chen Chos-kyi-'byung-gnas as well.

The ‘arbitrary designations’ or ‘random words’ (’dod-rgyal-gyi-sgra), as I have stated earlier, 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-rcchä-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 Dignäga’s Pramäña-samuccaya-vrttr.

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

1. ‘Straightforward word-explanation’ (sgra-drang-por-bshad-pa, 194v6-195r3)
2. ‘Explanation by means of derivation [or: etymology]’ ((sgra’i-khams-sosor) 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. 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).
As one example of (1) ‘straightforward explanation’, he quotes a(n unidentified) 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.’

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 liberated on account of the cessation [of suffering].’

Sa-pa offers a number of examples under the heading (2) ‘explanation by means of etymology’, one of them for the Sanskrit term kāya. Its etymology is traced to a verbal root kai, for which Sa-pa 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 dhātupātha-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 Dhātupātha 1.266 or Kātantra Dhātupātha 1.256.

Here also the case of the Sanskrit term arhat is briefly referred to, implicitly distinguishing between a grammatically formally correct etymology 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). 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. The Tibetan scholars—

---

101 Note that Sa-pa does not cite the Pāñinian Dhātupātha here, which reads kai gai śabde (1.965), and which, for instance, is cited in Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gnyis-pa in its comments on the term geya, cf. HSGLT 1: 39, HSGLT 2: 410.
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’\(^\text{104}\).

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\(^\text{105}\). 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’\(^\text{106}\).

Under the heading of the second subtype, ‘permutation of phonemes’, Sa-pan offers the following observation\(^\text{107}\):

‘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-pan 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-pan

---

\(^{104}\) SIBH 7, paragraph 2.2.


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

‘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] *anumāṇa* [meaning] ‘inference’ is formed; if combined with [the verbal preposition] *upa*-, [the term *upamāṇa* meaning] ‘analogy’ is formed; if combined with [the verbal preposition] *abhi*-, [the term *abhimāṇa* meaning] ‘self-conceit’ [is formed], etc.; one should know the application [of such formations] in [their] context.

---

\(^{108}\) Source thus far unidentified.


\(^{111}\) Note that Sa-pan claims that a ‘single basis *māṇa*’ underlies the four forms *pramāṇa* up to *abhimāṇa* this is in fact incorrect, or at least an oversimplification of the facts. The first three forms (*pramāṇa*, *anumāṇa* and *upamāṇa*) 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 *abhimāṇa* 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 niyate /
 gaṅgāsalilamādhuryam sāgareṇa yathāmbhāsā //_

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_\(^\text{112}\).

Finally, a third example which Sa-pan 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-pan 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\(^\text{113}\).

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\(^\text{114}\). Moreover, comparable in particular to the third type of interpretation, involving the


\(^{113}\) SIBH 4 paragraph 3.

\(^{114}\) Cf. HSGLT 2: 10-11.
manipulation of phonemes, is a typology by Padma Dkar-po (1527-1592) 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]’ (gzhann-du-bsgyur-ba).

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-pa 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).

(3.4) Chapter 2.4: Connection

In the fourth section of this chapter, on ‘connection’ (II.31-32), Sa-pa distinguishes two types of connection which the commentator should bring out:

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-pa’s treatment of these two types is quite brief.

Sa-pa 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 Dharmakīrti120 to the effect that communication can take place on the basis of the explicit as well as the implicit121.

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, he124 will now explain that same [topic] elaborately”’,125 Sa-pa terms the second subtype the statement of ‘connection by means of logical incompatibility and relation’126. This amounts

---

123 m dor-bstan-rgyas-bshad, in II.32, 203r6.
124 Or I, viz. the commentator?
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’.

The categorical distinction which Sa-pan 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. 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 Vyākhya yukti which is — of course in an adapted form — continued here in Sa-pan’s MJ, and that of the early Buddhist traditions, specifically the Theravāda which are primarily laid down in the para-canonical treatises Netti-ppakaraṇa and Peṭakopadesa.

Here, in Sa-pan’s treatment of ‘connection’, in certain respects the exposé on ‘consecutive connection’ in Netti-ppakaraṇa comes to mind.

---


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:

1. ‘connection of meaning[s]’ (Pāli atthasandhi)
2. ‘connection of word[ing]’ (Pāli byañjanasandhi)
3. ‘connection of expounding’ (Pāli desanāsandhi)
4. ‘connection of instruction’ (Pāli niddesasandhi)

This fourfold typology of ‘connection’ is reminiscent — up to a point — of the four types of ‘connection’ which Sa-pa∞ 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-pan 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

---


131 ṇāṇamoli (1962: xxxviii, 62): “meaning-sequence”.


134 ṇāṇamoli (1962: xxxviii, 63-64): “demonstration-sequence”.
pūrvapakṣa, ‘preliminary position’, and the teacher, or author of the commentary, representing the siddhānta, ‘established conclusion’.

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. 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. For the most part the section consists of a slightly more elaborate exposé of the ‘six alternatives’ (Skt. śaṭkoti, Tib. mtha’-drug, lit. ‘six extremes’ or ‘six limits’), a set of three alternative pairs of properties that play a role in scriptural interpretation. In his commentary ad II.34 Sa-pa 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).


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

(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 *satkoṣṭi* 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*)

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. In the Tibetan context it is also predominantly represented in Tantric exegesis, 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-pa. Here, in the second chapter of *MJ* as well as in the third chapter, sub verse 23, he applies this set to non-Tantric Buddha-Word as well. 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*.

---

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).


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. This applies in particular to the three sets of opposites brought together in the शातकोटि 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. Most notably this is the case for the नितार्थ/नेयार्थ (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. It is significant, in any case, that influential Tibetan scholastic authorities such as Sa-pa 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-pa 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. abhisamdhī, Tib. ldem-dgongs) and he refers to Mahāyānasūtraśrālāṃkāra as a source for further information on this topic. In his treatment of the fourth ‘alternative’ the author refers to Samdhinirmocanasūtra for the same purpose. Sa-pa concludes the section on the ‘six alternatives’ with a statement which again shows that our author indeed applies these hermeneutical categories to Sūtras and Tantras alike, adding a quotation from the Pradīpoddyotanā by (the Tantristic author) Candrakīrti:

---

151 ‘di-dag-rgyas-par-yi-ge-mangs-khyis-dgos-pas-ma-bris-te / mdo-sde-rgyan-la-sogs-par-bIha-bar-bya’o, 204r1-204r2. A locus classicus for these categories is indeed Mahāyānaśrālāṃkāra which at 12.16-18 introduces the four types of abhisamdhī (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 Samdhinirmocana 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]-samdhī in 7.29, 8.24 and 10.8).
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 meaning 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 pointing at (i.e. its meaning) and, so to speak, miss the point.

Finally, at the very end of the section on ‘objections and rebuttals’ Sa-paṅ also refers to his own major work on logic, the Tshad-ma-rigs-pa’i-gter for further reading on this topic.

(4) Concluding Observations

Sa-paṅ’s MJ has proven to be an eminently important source of information 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-paṅ 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, enumerated under twelve genres, which Sa-paṅ offers at the outset of MJ.


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-paṇṭ often deals with the five categories more or less in his own way, in part no doubt due to the fact that Sa-paṇṭ 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**

*HSGLT 1* = Verhagen (1994)
*HSGLT 2* = Verhagen (2001A)
*MJ* = *Mkhas-pa-'jug-pa'i-sgo*
*Sa-paṇṭ* = Sa-skyā Pandita 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)
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