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

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

2.2.1. Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gnis-pa: entry on "pratitya-samutpāda" - text.

P = Peking Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel NO 29r4–6,
C = Co-ne Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel CO 152v7–153r.


(The term) pratitya-samutpāda, (meaning) “origination (byuk-ba) in connection (brel-bar) by (causal) dependence (rten-chön)”: pratiti(ya)25 is to be translated as (la-bya) “to depend on” (rten-pa) or “to (have) become the cause” (rhyen-du ’gyur-ba/gyur-pa).

sam, i.e., (ste) satbandhin26 is to be translated as “connected (with)” (brel-pa).

“utpāda”27 is a word (denoting) “origination” (skyey-ba).

The external and internal elements (chos) do not arise independently, but (i) they arise from accumulated (shogs-pa) primary and secondary causes, that is (ste), there is origination (byuk-ba) of every following (phyi-ma-phyin-mal) element in the chain of causation) causally dependent (rgya-la-hrten-mas) on the (respective) preceding (sha-ma-rla-ma-l) element without the intervention (bar-ma-chod-par) of another (gtsan-gyi.sl) element. Therefore the accepted translation is “origination in connection by (causal) dependence.”

2.3 Discussion of the passage.

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

The first elements could be read as pratita or pratitya (cf. note 33). In the former case this form is not simply a constituent element separated from the compound term, but another form derived from the same verbal root i with the preposition prati. One could surmise a passive denotation in this term, as pratita can mean “having been depended on” (in other words: “having functioned as cause”);28 pratitya, the form as it occurs in the term discussed here, generally has an active denotation: “after having depended on” (i.e., “dependent on”, “based on”).29

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1. *Blo-gros-brtan-pa*’s excursus on "*pratitya-samutpāda*": introduction.

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

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

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

It might seem tempting to identify the excursus under consideration with a treatise on Sanskrit grammar known as Dpan-lo’i-sog-g cig-ma, “(treatise) consisting of one folio, of Dpan-lo’i-tsä-ba Blo-gros-brtan-pa),” which is referred to in A-khu-tho-yig, the well-known nineteenth-century Tibetan catalogue of books then already rare or extraordinarily valuable. The present excursus does indeed cover circa one folio in the various canonical editions. However, in a treatise on difficult points in Sanskrit grammar by Žam-dbyaṅs-bţad-pa Nag-dban-brtson-grus (1648–1721) we find a quotation from Dpan-lo’i-sog-g cig-ma,\textsuperscript{48} which is not to be found in the excursus on pratitya- samutpāda. Therefore the identification of this excursus with Dpan-lo’i-sog-g cig-ma is untenable.

Aside from the two scholars called Blo-gros-brtan-pa mentioned above, two more scholars of the same name, sometimes referred to as “the third Blo-gros-brtan-pa” and “the fourth Blo-gros-brtan-pa,” appear in translators’ colophones. The proposed identification of the third Blo-gros-brtan-pa with Yar-khung-lo-tsä-ba Grgs-pa-rgyal-mtshan (b. c. 1285/1295–d. after 1378) seems far from certain. The fourth Blo-gros-brtan-pa is generally identified as Šhe-than-lo-tsä-ba Blo-gros-brtan-pa (mid-fifteenth century).\textsuperscript{49}

In this excursus, the grammatical derivation of the term pratitya- samutpāda is described strictly according to the Cāndra system of
3.2.1. Blo-gros-brtan-pa's excursus on "pratītya-samutpāda": text.

P = Peking Bstan-'gyur Mdo'-grel LE 82v4-83r3,
C = Co-ne Bstan-'gyur Mdo'-grel RE 70v3-71v1 (C variant readings given in the notes):

/on-su-ja-stis-sam-sngags-bcom-ltan-das-dan//

"phags-pa-klu-grub-la-phyag-tshul-lo/
(2) de'i-ra-rtags-bki-don-yin-pas-phyes-te-(C/ly-brag-gol/)
(3) de-la-tsbi-gsal-dan-mzas-grel-du/ /s'i-te-mi-'gro-ba'i-don-to/ zhes-(P 82v7):gsuns-pa-ni-bbyins-su-mtshon-pa-la-slip/ /rkyen-shyar-ba-te/ /tsandra'i-(C 70v6):mo-le'u-gsum-par-ran-gi-no-bo-la-i-dan/- ki-dan-(C: /)
slip-(P;) o-zhes-gsuns-pas-slip/0./
(4) de'i-sa-dan-(C/3pa-rtags-bki-don-yin-pas-(P 82v8):dbyi'0/
(5) le'u-ti-su-gnas-par-nya-ba'i-don-gyi-ik/i-sat-(P:-)en(P:) o-zhes-pas-i-geur-le/e-t'i/0/
(6) de-bod-bki-yig-mkhan-gyes-i-ti-ru-nor-snan-(C 70v7):no/
(7) byins-su/gyar-strgyu-gso-yin-ro/
(10) le'u-ti-su-(C 71r1):par-nah, min-pa'i-tshi-gsal-dal-ma-kktu'i-le-pa'i-o-gs-zhes-pas-ktu-i-yap-ru-bgyur-ro/
(12) le'u:bcu-bdzur-par/thun-nu'i-(C 71r2):tin-ma-yin-pa-la-3pit-la-tuk.0i(P:/)fes-pas-i-dan-yi'0-bar-du-tuk-(P:) o/
(14) le'u-bcu-bdzur-par/ak(P:)-ni-ak(P:)-la-rin-po'o-zhes-pas-pra-ti'i7-i-yig-dan-bbyins-(C 71r3):kyi-i-yig-gnas-dag-rin-por-byas-(P 82v5):te/ pra-fi-tu-a/o/
(15) /de-'u-bzi-par-don-tshan-la-dan-po/’i /zes-pa²⁴-nam-dbyer-dan-po-su-shyang-ro/
(17) /P. S8v6/ /yan-byins-dib/’a /C71r4/ /sogs-su-pa(P-)/’gro-ha-la’o-zes-pas-’pa-da²⁷-byins-so/
(18) /de-i-ston-du-sam/’a-dan/’ud(P-)/-tha-bskyar-ro/
(19) /gro-ba’i-don-can-gyi-byins-yan-ni-er³⁶-bskyar-de-dag-dan-grel/’a-bas’byun-ba/(P S8v7)/la’u-jug-ste/ksad-kyi-byins-ni-stobs-idan-zes-sogs-so/
(20) /’le-u-gsum/(C71r5)/par(C-)/’byed-pa-la’u-an-gsal/(P-)/’o-zes-pas-gsal/(P-)/’i-rgyen-sbyar-ro/
(21) /’chos-i’or-ga-yig-bdag-la/gcha-dan-’u-u-yig-rtags-kyi-don-tu/
(22) /P S8v8/ /le’u-nu-geg-par(C-)/’yi-l’a’o-zes-pa-de-gon-gi-’at(P-)/’zes-pa²⁴-pa-la-brangs-pas-pa²⁴-zes-par-sbyar-ro/
(24) /’di-na-sin-tu-mkhas-par-khas/’che-yun/-
/di-tsham-gyi-kyan-mgo-bo-romos/’gyur-ba/
/dtos-pa-’jun-nus-tshig-pa²⁴-de/(P 83r2)/C71r7/kyan²²/-
/myur-du-ri-t/’byun-nun-sum-rtags-par-sog/
(25) /’ri-tu-chi’-brul-par/’byun-’zes-pa/
/chos-rnam-kun-gyi-cho-srid-kyi/’
/chos-kun-spros-bral-’id-gsamt-pa/
/gtis-med-gsun/(P 83r3)/das-sras-bcas-mchod/
(26) /ces-pa-dpal-idan-blo-gros-brtan/(C71v1)/pas-bar-skabs-su-smras-pa²⁴/’o/

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

3.2.2. Blo-gros-brtan-pa’s excursus on “pratiṣṭha-samutpāda”: translation. (Introduction) Because on this (subject) even in the scientific treatises some defects occur, such as unanalyzed definitions etc., (and because) moreover (yan) even (’am) some incorrect translations appear (as a result of that), (I) have written (the following) as it seems (to me) to be of great benefit for beginners.38

May it be for the benefit of many living beings.

(Maṅgala) Om svasti. (I) pay homage to the Bhagavat Buddha and to Ārya Nāgarjuna.

(1) According to (Cāndrapāla II.12), inN t’a gatau 40 (from i.e.) in the (group of) verbal roots ad etc., 49 inN occurs as a verbal root. 49
(2) Of this (root inN) the (letter) N is elided, 49 as it is intended as a marker, 49 and i remains (as the actual root).
(3) (In) the phrase etir gatyārthākāra occurring in the Prasannapadā and the commentaries on the (Abhidharma)-Kośa (when dealing) with this (de-las) root (from), where the verbal root is quoted in an example-form (mtshom-pa), the suffix ni StīP has been affixed; StīP (is prescribed) in the third chapter of the sūtra-(text) of Cāndrapāla (vyākaraṇa) by (the sūtra) i-Ki-StīPah swarāpe (Cāndrapāla 1.3.96). 49
(4) Of this (suffix StiP) the (letters) S and P are elided, as they are intended as markers.

(5) According to the sūtra, iKe 'D-eN kṛiṣṭṭhāyah (Cāndra 6.2.1)19 in the twenty-second chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-cyākaraṇa), i should be changed into e, (resulting in the form): eti.

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

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

(8) Before this (root i) verbal preposition100 prati (occurs), and whatever case-ending100 is affixed to this (verbal preposition prati) will be elided, as a compound100 with an indeclinable100 (as first member) is formed.

(9) As according to (the sūtra), eka-kartiṣṭhyah pūrañī (Cāndra 1.3.131)114 in the third chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-cyākaraṇa), (the suffix) Kta is required, the suffix Kta is affixed to (prati + i).

(10) According to (the sūtra), a-nyaśamāke Ktoe LyaP (Cāndra 5.4.6)120 in the twentieth chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-cyākaraṇa), (the suffix) Kta is changed into LyaP.

(11) As of this (suffix LyaP) the letter L (is intended as a marker) with a function concerning accent,100 and the letter P is intended as a marker resulting in the occurrence of (augment) tUK, (the letters L and P) are elided and morpheme ya remains.

(12) According to (the sūtra), hrasvasyañi piti tUK (Cāndra 5.1.69)120 in the seventeenth chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-cyākaraṇa), (augment) tUK occurs in between (the root) i and (the suffix) ya.

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

(14) According to (the sūtra), aKo 'Ki dirghah (Cāndra 5.1.106)100 in the seventeenth chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-cyākaraṇa), the letter i of (the verbal preposition) prati and the letter i of the verbal root (i) are both combined into a long (vowel i), (resulting in the form) pratiya.

(15) According to (the sūtra), arthāmāte prathamā (Cāndra 2.1.53)100 in the fourth chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-cyākaraṇa), the first case-ending sU116 should be affixed.

(16) (However, as a form ending with the suffix) LyaP is an indeclinable (asamkhyāta or avyaya),112 according to (the sūtra) sUL-paṃ samkhyāl Iuk (Cāndra 2.1.38)112 in the fourth (chapter of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-cyākaraṇa), (the suffix) sU is elided.

(17) Further (i.e. concerning the term samuśāda) according to (Cāndra Dhātupātha IV.107), padA gata213 in the (group of) verbal roots div etc.,114 the verbal root padA (occurs).

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

(19) Although (padA) is a root with the meaning "to go", because of the combination with these two verbal prepositions (viz. sam and ud), it functions (here) in the sense of "to arise"; (this occurs) according to (the maxim) "Although the verbal roots have (certain) forces (i.e. de-and connotations) etc."115
(20) According to (the sūtra), GHāN kārake ca (Cāndra 1.3.7)\textsuperscript{10} in the third chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa), the suffix GHāN is affixed.

(21) The vowel\textsuperscript{17} of GHāN\textsuperscript{18}, i.e. the letter a remains, but the letters GH and Ā are intended as markers (and hence are elided).

(22) As according to (the sūtra), haṅī ca (Cāndra 6.1.9)\textsuperscript{19} in the twenty-first chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa), āT (i.e. long vowel ā) is required in this above-mentioned form pāda before GHāN, the form pā is applied.

(23) In the words of the grammarians, according to the maxim “The accentless (consonant) must be combined with the accented vowel,”\textsuperscript{20} the (letter) m of sam will be connected with the vowel (sro) u and the (letter) d (of pāda) will be connected with the letter a of GHāN, (resulting in the form) samuṭpāda.

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

(25) To the unequalled teacher,\textsuperscript{21} who has taught (gsongs-pa) the non-plurality (spros-bral-rig) of all elements (chos-kun) on the basis of the nature (chos-rig) of all elements (chos-rigs-kun), which is called “origination in connection by (causal) dependence”, and to his (spiritual) sons (I) pay homage.

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

3.3 Discussion of the excursus.

In this highly technical excursus the author Blo-gros-brtan-pa follows Cāndra-vyākaraṇa, the grammatical system of Cāndra(gomin).\textsuperscript{122} Not only is the Cāndra grammar explicitly mentioned in the text (Isandra\textsuperscript{1}(t-mdo) P 82r7, C70v5–6), but all quoted sūtras could be identified as rules in the Cāndra grammar. Also, the two Dhātupāthas-entries that are quoted correspond to entries in the Cāndra Dhātupātha.\textsuperscript{123} As for the phrases, apparently quoted as maxims (in [3], [19] and [23]; cf. notes 94–96, 115 and 120), other than with regard to the actual sūtras, they are of general validity in the Indian grammatical traditions and can very well be applied within the Cāndra system.

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

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

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

When comparing the two canonical passages presented above two differences in their handling of Sanskrit grammatical analysis immediately become apparent.

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

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

NOTES

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


5. Lee-khyi-’brug (alias Ce-khyi-’brug or Ci-khyi-’brug) is a Tibetan translator datable to the end of the eighth or early ninth century; cf. Simonsson (1957: 243–244) and Miller (1963: 486–487)(= repr. 1975: 2–3). He was the author of two (or three) texts on Sanskrit grammar, viz. Gnas-bryad-chen-po’i-rtsa-ba, “Root-text on the eight (grammatical) topics”, Peking Bstan-’gyur Mdo-’grel NO 40v6–43v7, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5836, Co-ne Bstan-’gyur Mdo-’grel CO 163r1–165r5, and an auto commentary on this text entitled Sgra’i-bstan-bcos, “Linguistic treatise” or Gnas-bryad-kyi-’grel-pa, “Commentary on (the root-text on) the eight (grammatical) topics”, Peking Bstan-’gyur Mdo-’grel NO 43v8–54r6, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5837; Co-ne Bstan-’gyur Mdo-’grel CO 165r5–173v4; the third grammatical treatise attributed to him—though his authorship is not certain—is entitled Sgra’i-

6. This commentary is entitled Kalāpa-laghu-vṛtti-śisyahitā, Tib. Ka-lā-pa’i-’grel-pa-lun-nu-las-slob-ma-la-phan-pa, Peking Bstan-’gyur Mdo-’grel LE 125v5–163v5, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5777; Co-ne Bstan-’gyur Mdo-’grel LE 31r3–62v5. It is an excerpt, in fact the first four chapters on verbal morphology, from an extensive commentary on Kalāpa (or Kātantra) grammar entitled Śisyahitā.


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


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


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

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


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


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

23. C: ti
24. C: mu-tpa
25. C: gyur-pa
26. C: ba-nāha-sta
27. C: sipatīa
28. C: tshig-phyi
29. C: sna-ma’i
30. C: brien
31. C: ma
32. C: gvis

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

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

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

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

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

40. Cf. Simonsson (1957: 245–246, 269–270), where I take sgrubzhen-du to mean "according to the word-(form)," i.e. according to the morphology; Simonsson (1957: 245) translates: "dem Laut gemass."

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

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

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

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

44. P 83r3, C 71r7–v1.
45. Cf. note 11 above.
46. He is the younger brother and pupil of Śon-ston Rdo-rje-rgyal-
mtshan (cf. note 10 above) and he is known to have met Thags-pa
(1235–1280), so he can be dated to the late thirteenth or early four-
presumably "troisième siècle" should be read instead of "douzième"),
and Taube (1978: 194 note 146).
47. P 82r2–3, C 70v2–3.
48. Dpar-ló'i-sog-gcig-ma is entry 17.4 in A-khu-tho-yig, section on
Sanskrit grammar, ed. L. Chandra, Materials for a History of Tibetan
Literature, Part 3, New Delhi 1963, p. 577, nr. 12874. The quotation
from this text is to be found in Legs-sbyar-gces-pa'i-gnas-bsdus-mgrin-
pa'i-legs-sgrogs-ran'-grol-ḥes-by-a-ba, 8 ff. in vol. KA of the Gsun-'bum of
'Jam-dbyangs-bzad-pa Nag-dpa-brtson-'grus, ed. N. G. Demo, The
Collected Works of 'Jam-dbyangs-bzad-pa'i-rdo-rje, reproduced from prints
from the Bkra-śis-'khyil blocks, vol. 1, New Delhi 1974, pp. 523–538. The
quoted passage is a verse dealing with the notion of augment (San-
skrit rāgama):

50. C: pa-yan-bag
51. C: lam
52. C: i-na
53. C: rtags, which is the correct reading. P's rtags must be erroneous considering the following allomorph of the genitive particle, scil. kyi.

54. C: gzhag
55. C: e-ti, which is certainly preferable to i-te (in P), cf. note 94.
56. C: sti-pa'i
57. C: sti-pa'0
58. C: bya
59. C: ig'i
60. C: rgyu-li(sic)-i
61. C: me
62. C: ste/
63. C: gan
64. C: ktwa
65. C: na-ña
66. C: ktwa'i-lya-pa'0
67. C: dbyiṅs (sic)
68. C: tuk
69. C: gzhag
70. C: le'ur
71. C: pi-ta-la-tu-ka'0
72. C: ti'i (sic)
73. C: pas
74. C: lya-pa
75. C: pa-yin-pas-na/ bṣi
76. C: su-pa'i
77. C: pa
78. C: diw
79. C: pad
80. C: sa-ma
81. C: ri
82. C: sgre?i
83. C: ces
84. C: râ(i)
85. C: ghan'i
86. C: ra(i)
87. C: de-rnams-(C 71r7)rjan
88. las-dan-po, the reading in P, is preferable to C lam-dan-po; cf. also las-dan-po-pa-rnams-la in the passage from the Co-ne Bstan-'gyur Dkar-chag quoted in note 43.
89. Transl.: “(The verbal roots) i(i) (viz. i), vi and vâ (occur) in the meaning ‘to go.’”
90. This is the so-called second conjugational class of Sanskrit verbs, of which the root ad is the first in order in all major Dhâtapâyas.
91. Tibetan byins (P 82r5, r6, r7, r8, v4, v6; skad-kyi-byins P 82v7) translates Sanskrit dhâtu (cf. Mahâvyutpatti 4707), the technical term for the verbal root; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 207–208).
92. In a grammatical context, forms of the verb 'phyi-ba, such as phyis (P 82r6, v3, v4) and dbyi (P 82r8, v1, v5) denote “to be elided” or “elision,” as an equivalent to derivations from the root lups (esp. lopa) in Sanskrit grammatical idiom; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 335 s.v. lup, 337 s.v. lopa).
93. Emend rtags (P 82r6) to rtags, cf. note 53.
Rtags (P 82v7, v3, v7), “market,” refers to the technical device of it or anubanda, the letters (transliterated as capital letters in the present article, a fairly common practice in Indological literature) that—in a grammatical context—can be joined to roots or suffixes to indicate certain morphological or phonological properties of the element in question; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 25 s.v. anubanda, 69–70 s.v. it[1]).
94. Transl.: “(The verbal root) i denotes ‘to go.’ The reading in C, e-ti-ni-’gro-ba’i-don-to, is preferable to P i-te-ni... , as the rest of this passage (3–5) describes the derivation of precisely the citation-form eti to refer to the root i; cf. notes 95 and 96.
95. Scil. eti gaty-artha, in Prasannapadâ, Candrakirti’s commentary on Nâgârjuna’s Mûla-madhyanaka-kârikâ (in fact in the passage dealing with the term pratitya-samutpâda), ed. L. de la Vallée Poussin, St. Petersburg 1913, p. 5 line 1; cf. also note 115.
96. E.g. eti gaty-artakah in Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya, ed. P. Pradhan, Patna 1975, p. 138 line 2; cf. also iti gataḥ and (ayam) iti gaty-artham (ujjhitvā) in Yaśomitra’s Sphutārthā Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā, a commentary on Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośa, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932–1936, part III, p. 294 line 21 and 23 respectively. In either case, the phrase is found in a passage dealing with the term pratītya-samutpāda. Cf. also note 115.


98. Transl.: “When the own form (of a verb is to be expressed the suffixes) i, Ki and StiP (occur behind the verbal root in question);” Vṛtti on Cāndra 1.3.96: kriyārthasya svarūpaḥ bhūdeye kriyārthāḥ pare i-Ki-StiPo bhavanti, Liebich (1918: 63).

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

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

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

In fact the Cāndra system of grammar in its basic texts avoids the use of technical grammatical terms; for instance, it refers to the group of verbal prepositions as prādi, “(the group) pra etc.,” cf. Vṛtti on Cāndra 1.1.109. On the semantical role of verbal prepositions, cf. note 115.

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


103. Cf. note 111.
104. Transl.: “When two (actions) have one and the same agent (karta), (the suffix) Ktvā (occurs) after the (verb which expresses the action taking place) earlier;” Vṛtti on Cāndrā 3.1.31: ekakartaḥ karyor vyapārayor madhye yah pūrvavypāras tadarthat Ktvā bhavati, Liebich (1918: 72); cf. Pāṇini 3.4.21. Ktvā is the so-called gerund or absolute suffix tvā; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 131 s.v. Ktvā(3)).

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

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

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

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


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

112. Transl.: “Elision (luk) of the nominal case-ending (sUPI) (occurs) after an indeclinable;” Vyrtti on Cāṇḍra 2.1.38: avidyaṃnasamikhyāti parasya sUPIo lug bhavati, Liebich (1918: 102); cf. Panini 1.1.38.

113. Transl.: “(The verbal root) padA (occurs) in the meaning ‘to go.’”

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

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

upasargena dhātvartho balād anṛatra nīyate/  
gangāśātimādadhuryam sāgareṇa yathāṁbhāsa/!

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

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

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

eti gāyatrayathā pratik prāptiyarthah/upasargavaihāna dhiyavartha-viparinchātā/ [. . .]  
pratityasabādo ‘tra LyaBṣaṇaḥ prāptih aprakṣāyān varta, (The verbal root) i denotes “to go;” and (verbal preposition) prati denotes “to attain.” On account of the verbal preposition a change in the meaning of the verbal root
takes place;...so the word pratītya, ending in (suffix) LyaP, here functions with the meaning ‘to attain’ (prāpti) (or) ‘to depend (on)’ (apeksā).

Cf. the similar passage: pratiḥ prāpyarthha eti gatyarthah/ upasarga-vraṣena dhāturthaviparināmāt prāpyeti yo ‘rthaḥ pratītyeti/, in the Abhidhammakośa-bhāṣya loc. cit. (cf. note 96) p. 138, line 1–2. Cf. also the Sphuṭārthā Abhidhammakośa-vyākhya loc. cit. (cf. note 96) p. 294, line 22–23:

pratiḥ copasargah prāptidvyotaka ity ayaṃ tīr gatyartham ujjhītya prāpyartham āpadyate. And verbal preposition prati indicates ‘to attain,” so (in the combination prati + the root i (citation form iti) loses (its) meaning ‘to go’ and adopts the meaning ‘to attain’ (viz. on account of the verbal preposition prati).

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

samutpādaḥ padīḥ prādūrbhāvītāḥ iti samutpādaśabdaḥ prādūrbhāve varītā. “(The verbal root) padī preceded by (verbal prepositions) sam and ud denotes ‘to arise’, so the word samutpāda functions in the meaning ‘to arise;” and the Abhidhammakośa-bhāṣya loc. cit. p. 138, line 3: padīḥ satīrthaḥ samutpādaḥ prādūrbhāvītāḥ, “(The verbal root) padī denotes ‘to exist’; (however), preceded by (verbal prepositions) sam and ud it denotes ‘to arise.’”

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

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


118. Emend gha’i to: ghan’i.

119. Transl.: “(Long vowel ā—i.e. āT—occurs as a substitute instead of short vowel a—i.e. aT—which is the penultimate letter of an element) when (an element) with marker N or  ObjectOutputStream, Vṛttī on Cāndrā 6.1.9: nīti nītī ca parata upānitasayaTa āD bhavati, Liebich (1918: 427); cf. Panini 7.2.116. Emend nidd (P 82v8) to n(ā-)nīd; perhaps this is an error caused by the similarity to the Tibetan word nīd, ‘self’?

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

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


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

124. Cf. Liebich (1895: 39–44); cf. also note 126.
125. Cf. Liebich (1895: 9–12); cf. also note 126.

127. The application of 5.1.106 (here: prati + i ... = prati ...) results in the disappearance of one of the conditions for applying 5.1.69, viz. a short vowel, and so would prevent the subsequent application of 5.1.69. I know of no separate studies on rule ordering in Cāndra; an important study on rule ordering in Pāṇini is P. Kiparsky, “Lecture III. The Ordering of Rules in Pāṇini’s Grammar,” in Some Theoretical Problems in Pāṇini’s Grammar, Poona 1982, pp. 77–121.

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

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

('A 2v8): de-la-pra-ti-ni-(3r3:phrad-pa'i-don-to/
fi-ti-(soc:ni)gro-ba'i-don-to/
/lyap-kyi-mi:'can-pra-ti-tya'i-sgra-ni-phrad-pa-ste-blus-pa-la,'jug-pa-yin-te/)
skad-kyi-byins-nil-ten-bar-bsgyur-has-yongs-su-bsgyur-ba'i-phiyur-ro//\(3r2\):ten-bar-bsgyur-ba'i-dbang-gis-nil/\(3r2\):
/skad-byins-don-nil-yongs-bsgyur-te/\(2\):
gang'a-chu-nil-mnar-mod-kyi/\(2\):
rgya-mtsho-chu-yis-nil-bzin-no-zes-bsad-do/\(2\):

It is found again in the second interpretation of pratitya (where the Sanskrit text apparently also has it; cf. note 130):

\(\text{g'an-dag-nil-(gra-ti-nil-zlos-pan-i-don-to)/i-ti-(sic)ni-'gro-(3r4):ba'i-ste-
chun-par-dan-'dok-pa-o'}\).

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

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

3.2.1:

   In: note 43:
   Co-ne Bstan-'gyur Dkar-chag 296v5–6:

   In: note 129:
   Peking Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel 'A 2v8–3r4, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958) vol. 98, 3–2–2 to 3–3–4:
APPENDIX

Scheme of derivational procedure in 3.2

1) C.D. 2.12 : iN
   C. 1.3.96 : iN + Sīp
   C.V. ad 1.1.5 : i + Ø + Ø + ti + Ø
   C. 6.2.1 : e + ti
     eti-

2) C.D. 2.12 : iN
   C.V. ad 1.1.5 : i + Ø
     : prati + i
   C. 2.1.93 : (prati + sU) + i
   C. 2.1.38 : (prati + Ø) + i
   C. 1.3.151 : prati + i + Ktvā
   C. 5.4.6 : prati + i + LyāP
   C. 5.1.69 : prati + (i + tUK) + LyāP
   C.V. ad 1.1.5 : prati + (i + t + Ø) + Ø + ya + Ø
   C. 5.1.106 : prati + i + t + ya
   C. 2.1.93 : prati + i + t + ya + sU
   C. 2.1.38 : prati + i + t + ya + Ø
     prattīya

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

C. = Cāndra Vyākaranā sutra-text, ed. B. Liebich (1902), Cāndra-Vyākaranā, die Grammatik des Candragomin. Sūtra, Unādi, Dhātupāṭha, Leipzig (=Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XI), also Liebich (1918).
C.D. = Cāndra Dhātupāṭha, ed. Liebich (1902).
C.V. = Cāndra Vṛtti, ed. Liebich (1918).