Commentaries, Translations, and Lexica: Some Further Reflections on Buddhism and Philology

In his series of lectures on *A Philological Approach to Buddhism*[1] K.R. Norman has made an excellent case for the importance of philology in the study of Buddhism. In what follows I shall attempt a very modest addition to this picture by looking at some instances that highlight how knowledge of the specific techniques and conventions applied by indigenous commentators and translators can be of importance for lexicography and the interpretation of Buddhist texts.

Consider first of all the following entry in CPD: "**udara-jivhā-maṁsa**, *n.*, *'the flesh of the stomach's tongue'*; *description of the spleen*: pihakan ti ~aṁ, Vism 257,22 (jivhā-saṇṭhānaṁ udarassa matthaka-passe tiṭṭhanaka-maṁsaṁ, mhṭ *Se* II 29,7)." The expression "the flesh of the stomach's tongue", even though in some sense "literal", makes no sense at all, and although the commentary or *mahāṭīkā* is quoted, it has clearly not been consulted or understood. The commentary's interpretation of the compound comes a lot closer to describing what the spleen actually is: "The piece of flesh that is located at the upper side of the stomach and has the shape of a tongue."[2] This particular CPD entry results from a simple failure to read and take advantage of indigenous commentaries. Matters are not always so straightforward, and it can sometimes be difficult to know exactly when we are in a position to "remonter … à un pali d'intérêt linguistique", to use an expression from Helmer Smith.[3]

---

[1]The Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai Lectures delivered at SOAS in 1994; Norman 1997.

[2]That said, I feel somewhat surprised at the expression *matthaka-passe tiṭṭhanaka-maṁsaṃ* in this passage. Is it possibly an error for *matthaka-passe tiṭṭhanakaṃ maṃsaṃ*? I cannot see why the commentator would opt for a *sāpekṣasamāsa* here.

[3]Smith 1928, p. vi, "C'est donc dans la conviction que notre pali est une fonction de celui du 12ᵉ siècle — et que la connaissance de la philologie

The CPD entry for *udānana* runs: "**udānana**, *n.*, *vb. noun of* udāneti *q.v.*, *formed to explain* udāna; Sadd 382,21: ken'atthena udānaṃ ? °'atthena. kim idaṃ ~aṃ nāma ? pīti-vega-samuṭṭhāpito udāhāro (≠ Ud-a 2,11, *reading* udān'atthena, udānaṃ nāma)." Turning to the CPD entry for *udāna*, one finds: "**udāna**, *n. and m.* [*ts.*], *lit. 'the breathing upwards'*; **1.** (*medic.*) *one of the five vital airs, rising up the throat and entering the head*; **2.** *a solemn utterance, mostly, but not necessarily, in metrical form, inspired by intense emotion and made without regard to any listeners* ...; **3.** *the fifth of the nine* aṅgas (*divisions*) *of the Buddhist scriptures* ...; **4.** *the third book of the* Khuddaka-Nikāya *divided into 8* vaggas *and consisting of 80* suttas *each of which contains an* udāna *introduced by the standing phrase* imaṃ udānaṃ udānesi; ... *in very frequent standing phrase* ~aṃ udāneti (udānento, °nesi, °netvā)." The entry goes on to list occurrences. BHSD, on the other hand, has "**udāna**, m. or nt. (= Pali id.; with acc. pron. usually imam, sometimes idam), *a solemn but joyous utterance* (acc. to PTSD sometimes a sorrowful one in Pali), usually but not always having religious bearings; almost always in modulation of phrase imam ... udānam udānayati (usually with sma after verb), very common." Later in the entry we find: "nt. udānam, as n. of a type or class of Buddh. literature, one of the 12 (Mvy) or 9 (Dharmas) pravacanāni, Mvy 1271; Dharmas 62; Udāna-varga, n. of a specific work (abbreviated Ud)." BHSD also has the entry "**udānayati**, denom., *utters an udāna*: used virtually always with object **udānam**, q.v. for forms and passages."

In Pāṇinian grammar the term *kāraka* (lit.: "doer; accomplisher") applies to direct participants in actions. Such a participant is a *sādhana*,

---

birmane et singalaise de ladite époque est indispensable à qui voudra remonter, à travers la recension Buddhaghosa–Dhammapāla, à un pali d'intérêt linguistique —, que j'ai entrepris l'étude de la norme palie enseignée par Aggavaṃsa dans les trois volumes qui forment la Saddanīti." Quoted also by Caillat 1971, p. 84; Kahrs 1992, p. 5; and referred to by Norman 1983, pp. 6, 165. See also von Hinüber 1978.

a means of realising the action,[4] and every participant is assigned to one of a set of six *kāraka* categories.[5] The abstract syntactic level at which *kārakas* are introduced in the grammar serves to mediate between the levels of semantics and morphology. By this device Pāṇini is able to account for the relationship between possible semantic choices on the side of the speaker and some basic features of Sanskrit syntax and morphology. Such participants in actions are, at the abstract level of *kāraka* syntax, assigned to particular *kāraka*-categories. In a similar way the set of *lakāras*, a set of ten suffixes marked with an *L*, are introduced after verbal roots at the same abstract level. At this level all verbal endings, except for the ones that denote *bhāva* (lit.: "being; state of action"), can be said to signify agents and objects in relation to activities. By A 3.4.69 *laḥ karmaṇi ca bhāve cākarmakebhyaḥ* an L-suffix is added to a verbal root to denote — in addition to the agent (*kartari*, A 3.4.67) — the object, or, in the case of verbal roots which are objectless (*akarmaka*, that is, intransitive verbs), the mere activity expressed by the verbal root (*bhāva*). When the relevant semantic choices have been considered on the side of the speaker, the abstract syntactic level of *kārakas* and *lakāras* is sorted out. The correct distribution of case endings and finite verbal endings is then accounted for in the syntax of a Sanskrit sentence by means of operational rules.

However, *kārakas* do not pertain to the derivation of sentences alone. Any verbal noun derived by a *kṛt*-suffix (a primary suffix) is considered to denote either a participant in an action, in which case it is assigned to one or the other of the six *kāraka* categories, or it is considered to denote the mere activity (*bhāva*) expressed by the verbal root. By way of example, the suffix *LyuT* (-*ana* with *guṇa* and

---

[4]I analyse the term *sādhana* as *sādhyate 'nena*, "[something] is realised/ accomplished through it".

[5]In the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* these are defined in the following order: *apādāna* "stable point when there is movement away", *saṃpradāna* "recipient; indirect goal", *karaṇa* "instrument", *adhikaraṇa* "locus", *karman* "object; goal", and *kartṛ* "agent". Moreover, a subcategory of agent is defined, namely *hetu*, the causal agent.

presuffixal accent) is introduced to form neuter action nouns (*bhāve*), by A 3.3.115 *lyuṭ ca*, and also to form nouns expressing the instrument or the locus of the action expressed by the root, by A 3.3.117 *karaṇādhikaraṇayoś ca*. This means that when analysing a particular word, alternative interpretations are often possible. Accordingly, the word *udāna* quoted above can be interpreted as *bhāvasādhana*, that is to say, as an action noun (with *LyuṬ* by A 3.3.115 *lyuṭ ca*) denoting the mere activity of uttering or pronouncing, or, alternatively, as either *adhikaraṇasādhana*, that is to say, as a noun denoting a locus, "place of utterance", or *karaṇasādhana*, as a noun denoting a means of uttering (the latter two formed with *LyuṬ* by A 3.3.117 *karaṇādhikaraṇayoś ca* which teaches that this suffix is added also to denote the instrument and the locus). These rules do not permit its analysis as *karmasādhana*, that is, as denoting the object of the action.

Let me now return to the passage from the *Saddanīti* quoted under the CPD entry for *udānana*, Sadd 382,21–22: *ken' atthena udānaṃ: udānanatthena, kim idam udānanaṃ nāma: pītivegasamuṭṭhāpito udāhāro*, "In what sense *udāna*? In the sense of *udānana*. What is this that one calls *udānana*? It is an utterance (or, rather, an act of uttering) made to arise by the impetus of joy." The whole point of analysing *udāna* as *udānana* is simply to make it clear that it is interpreted as *bhāvasādhana*, as the act of uttering itself, and not as *karman*, an utterance in the form of an object, which would be the only reasonable interpretation of *udāna* in expressions such as *imaṃ udānaṃ udāneti* or *imam udānam udānayati* referred to above. Incidentally, the CPD entry for *udāhāra* runs: "**udāhāra**, *m.* [*ts.*], *utterance, pronouncement*; *in definitions of* udāna." The entry goes on to list references. This is clearly running in circles without bringing out the intentions behind the words taken from the glosses or interpretations of the indigenous sources.

Moreover, it certainly seems reasonable here to ask what constitutes "un pali d'intérêt linguistique", as it is natural to form a verbal noun such as *udānana* from any verb. In Yāska's *Nirukta*, more

than a hundred words are analysed by a construction that involves the ablative form of a neuter verbal noun in *-ana*, to be interpreted as a *nomen actionis* or *bhāvasādhana* if one adheres to Sanskrit terminology. A representative example of this type of construction is (Nir 9.26) *sindhuḥ syandanāt*. I suggest the following interpretation: "*sindhuḥ* (the river Indus, or 'river' in general) [is so called] on account of the streaming (*syandanam*)". The name *sindhuḥ* is related to the verbal noun by an ablative construction which explains why *sindhuḥ* came to signify the river of that name, or any river, and the construction is thus a natural reply to the question *kasmāt* "why?" The most commonly used Sanskrit dictionaries record that the neuter verbal nouns in *-ana* employed in this type of construction quite frequently are attested only in the *Nirukta*, a fact that indicates that these forms are in principle derived by Yāska himself for the technical purpose of *nirvacana* analysis. This type of analysis is also met with in Buddhist texts, for example in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* when it explains the word *dharma* at AK 1.2: *nirvacanaṃ tu svalakṣaṇadhāraṇād dharmaḥ*, "as for the *nirvacana*: on account of the holding/possessing (*dhāraṇam*)[6] [its] unique particular, [it is called] a *dharma*".

In his article "Sur quelques formations sanskrites en *-ti-*" Louis Renou (1951) drew attention to the fact that much as nouns in *-ti* are, in principle, "regular" formations, a number of them are nevertheless listed in the *uṇādisūtras*, or, more precisely, in the commentaries on the *uṇādisūtras*. As Renou points out (1951, p. 1), Hemacandra's *Dhātu-pārāyaṇa*, for example, presents a large number of forms in *-ti* that are lacking in standard Sanskrit dictionaries. "Plusieurs sont d'une authenticité douteuse, mais toutes méritent d'être signalées dans un Thesaurus,[7] étant donné l'intérêt qui s'attache à l'œuvre lexico-

---

[6]The noun *dhāraṇa* is formed from the causative stem of the root *dhṛ*, but this root is commonly used in the causative stem with no change of its basic meaning.

[7]Deccan College was planning a Sanskrit thesaurus at the time of the publication of Renou's article. The article appeared in the first issue of *Vāk*, published by Deccan College in 1951.

graphique de Hemacandra" (1951, p. 1). However, some formations in
⁻*ti* raise questions of a similar nature as did the neuter verbal nouns in
⁻*ana* above. That forms met with in the epigraphical record should be
included in dictionaries is obvious. As examples, Renou (1951, p. 2)
mentions *aṃhati* (variant *aṃhiti*) in the sense of "don", and *jñāti* in the
sense of "information, connaissance", among others.

Consider now the analysis of some forms in -*ti* and -*ana* met with
in the *Prasannapadā*, Candrakīrti's commentary on Nāgārjuna's *Mūla-
madhyamakakārikā* (edited by L. de La Vallée Poussin 1903–13, p. 4,
ll. 5–6):

> *tatra niruddhir nirodhaḥ kṣaṇabhaṅgo nirodha ity ucyate* |
> *utpādanam utpādaḥ ātmabhāvonmajjana[m ity arthaḥ]* |[8]
> *ucchittir ucchedaḥ prabandhavicchittir ity arthaḥ* |

The first line one could render: "In this respect,[9] *nirodha* is
niruddhi: it is *kṣaṇabhaṅga* that is called *nirodha*." In other words,
nirodha is explained by *niruddhi*, a verbal noun in -*ti* formed from the
same root with the same preverb. The form *niruddhi* is not met with in
extant lexica, including BHSD. It seems therefore likely that it was
derived by Candrakīrti for the particular purpose of interpreting *nirodha*
as *bhāvasādhana* by glossing it with a form in -*ti*, that is to say as
meaning "a ceasing". Candrakīrti goes on to say that *nirodha* is
kṣaṇabhaṅga. Now, it is not easy to provide an elegant translation for
the term *kṣaṇabhaṅga*, nor is it unambiguous how best to analyse the
compound. Suffice it to say that the term refers to the fact that all
phenomena are of momentary existence, hence a *vigraha* of the
compound could be *kṣaṇād bhaṅgaḥ*, the ceasing to exist after only one
moment, or, perhaps, *kṣaṇena bhaṅgaḥ* or *kṣaṇe bhaṅgaḥ*, the ceasing
to exist every moment, that is to say, "continuous instant ceasing".

---

[8]J.W. de Jong (1978, p. 29) prefers the reading *ātmabhāvonmajjanam* met with
in a manuscript acquired by G. Tucci which was not available to La Vallée
Poussin.

[9]The passage is introduced by the words *avayavārthas tu vibhajyate*, "but the
meaning of the various parts is explained in detail [as follows]".

The second line of the passage is a little more problematic, but it brings out the point I wish to make, namely that it is possible for the purpose of interpretation to form verbal nouns in *-ti* or *-ana* from any verb or verbal noun. The line could be rendered: "*utpāda* is *utpādana*, [that is to say,] the emerging of a bodily form". Here *utpāda* is glossed *utpādana*, which, as a causative formation, is somewhat difficult to reconcile with the fact that the verb *un-majj* "to emerge" is intransitive. Turning to standard lexica, we meet with further problems. For *utpādana* as a neuter noun, MW has "the act of producing or causing, generating, begetting". *A Dictionary of Pāli* (M. Cone 2001) has "**uppādana**, *n., ~ā, f.* [*S.* utpādana], *producing, generating*". Should we emend to *utpadana*, that is to say, to a non-causative form? Edgerton lists the form *utpadyana* in BHSD: "**utpadyana** (nt.; = Pali uppajjana: MIndic -ana formation to utpadyate), *production, origination*: Gv 48.5 (prose), read: harṣa-utpadyana-saṃtānāni (see s.v. **saṃtāna 2**)". "Production" and "origination" are unlikely synonyms, since they are based on transitive and intransitive verbs respectively. Under *utpadyati*, however, BHSD has "(**2**) in mg. of Skt. caus. utpādayati, *produces, causes*". Turning to the entry for *saṃtāna* that Edgerton referred to above, one finds that he translates *harṣa-utpadyana-saṃtānāni* "their mental conditions productive of joy". Here he seems to take *utpadyana* as transitive.

In any case, *utpādana* remains problematic. A form *utpadana* is not met with in lexica. To emend to *utpādyana* is problematic. The solution that emerges as the most plausible is therefore to conclude that Candrakīrti formed *utpādana* directly on *utpāda*, again to make it clear that he interprets *utpāda* as *bhāvasādhana*, "an emerging". This conclusion is supported by the continuation of the explanation: *ātma-bhāvonmajjana*, "the emerging of a bodily form", where *unmajjana* is a neuter action noun in *-ana*.

Finally, *ucchittir ucchedaḥ prabandhavicchittir ity arthaḥ* could be rendered: "*uccheda* is *ucchitti*, that is to say, the ceasing of continuity". Once again, Candrakīrti makes it clear that he takes *uccheda* "cutting

off, destruction, annihilation" to be *bhāvasādhana* by glossing it with a feminine verbal noun in *-ti*, *ucchitti*, "a cutting off, a destroying". Again the gloss is formed from the same root with the same preverb. The form *ucchitti*, however, is attested in lexica, as is the further gloss °*vichitti*, another formation in *-ti*.

Now, one may argue that forms such as *niruddhi* and *utpādana* do not merit the distinction of being "d'intérêt linguistique", but what they convey about the terms they are used to interpret certainly does.

It is of course not only in commentaries on Buddhist texts that problems and issues of interpretation arise, but also in translations of them into other languages such as Tibetan and Chinese. In his article "La légende de Śāntideva",[10] J.W. de Jong (1975) reproduces the Sanskrit text of the Śāntideva legend as edited by Haraprasād Śāstri and the Tibetan text of the Peking edition. Section X of the text reads as follows:

> *śāntidevanāmā praśāntatvāt piṭakatrayaṃ śrutvā dhyāyati sma | bhuñjāno 'pi prabhāsvaraṃ supto 'pi kuṭiṃ gato 'pi tad eveti bhūsukusamādhisamāpannatvāt bhūsukunāmākhyātaṃ |*
>
> *źi-ba daṅ-ldan-pas źi-ba'i lha źes miṅ-btags | der sde-snod gsum mñan (P. mñam)pa'i rjes-la za-ruṅ ñal-ruṅ 'chags-ruṅ rgyun-tu 'od-gsal bsgom-pas bhu-su-ku źes tiṅ-ṅe-'dzin la gnas-pa'i phyir bhu-su-ku źes miṅ yoṅs-su grags-so ‖*

In a note to the word *prabhāsvaram*, de Jong (1975, p. 173, n. 29) remarks, "Il y a probablement une lacune dans le texte, cf. T." (T. = la traduction tibétaine). The Tibetan text de Jong translates (1975, p. 176), "En raison de sa tranquillité on lui donna le nom Śāntideva. Ayant écouté les trois piṭaka, il méditait sur la lumière sans interruption en mangeant, en dormant et en marchant. Persistant ainsi dans le samādhi appelé bhusuku, il fut connu sous le nom de Bhusuku." Somehow, this does not quite hit the mark. The Tibetan *der* indicates a *tatra* which is not met with in the Sanskrit version, and *rgyun-tu* "always" probably means the translator has read *sadaiva* for *tad eva*. However, there is no

---

[10]Apropos Pezzali 1968.

lacuna in the text. Bhusuku is the name of one of the eighty-four
Siddhas. The Tibetan translation has not picked up on or been unable to
render the *nirvacana*-based reasoning met with in the Sanskrit.

In the passage above, I take *tad eva* to mean *tad eva prabhāsvaram.
iti …*: "For this reason …". In his translation, de Jong gives the name in
question as Bhusuku, and, for reasons that will be clear below, I too see
no reason for retaining the long *ū* of the Sanskrit text. Moreover, I do
not feel comfortable with *bhusukunāmākhyātam* as Sanskrit. I would
expect a masculine °*ākhyātaḥ* here: "For this reason he was named
Bhusuku" (*bhu-su-ku źes miṅ yoṅs-su grags-so*). On this basis, one
could then translate the Sanskrit passage as follows: "Called Śāntideva
because of his tranquility (*praśāntatvāt*), after studying the three Piṭakas
he meditated on the radiant [mind] even when he was eating
(*bhuñjānaḥ*), even when he was asleep (*suptaḥ*), even when in the
[latrine] hut (*kuṭiṃ gataḥ*),[11] [and] on that alone. So because he was
immersed in Samādhi [even] when *bhu*[*ñjānaḥ*], *su*[*ptaḥ*], and *ku*[*ṭiṃ
gataḥ*] he was called Bhusuku."[12]

---

[11]That the word *kuṭi* here means "latrine" is indicated by the explanation
viṇmūtrotsargārtham met with in the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* in a section on
bhusukucaryā that contains a similar *nirvacana* analysis of *bhusuku* as the
one discussed above. Cf. CMP 99,4–11: *anenānupūrveṇa yuktāgamābhyām
adhigamarūpāṃ sarvabuddhajananīṃ niścitya sarvārallir viṣayāsaktiṃ ca
prahāya* **bhusukucaryayā** *cared anena krameṇa. tatrāyaṃ kramaḥ – bhu iti
bhuktvā tanmātram anusmarati saṃgamam apaharati duṣkarair niyamair iti
kiṃcin na cintanīyam. su iti suptvā etad vijñāya na vidyopalakṣitaṃ
sākṣātkurvīta saivāvidyāṃkuśākāraṃ(rāṃ)kitavijñānaṃ punar āvartayati
prabhāsvaram eva sākṣātkaroti nirmalasvabhāvam. ku iti kuṭiṃ gacchet
viṇmūtrotsargārthaṃ tanmātram anubhavati saṅgam apanayati kāyavedanā-
viṣayendriyasvabhāvaṃ ca na cintayed iti*. The passage as it stands requires
some textual criticism, but that need not concern us here.

[12]However, Alexis Sanderson informs me that in the *Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa
bzhi'i lo rgyus*, which the monk Smon grub śes rab claims at its end to have
put into Tibetan after the stories had been narrated to him by an Indian guru
called *Abhayadattaśrī (Mi 'jigs sbyin pa dpal), we are told that Bhusuku
(identified with Śāntideva, as in the text above) was a notoriously ignorant
monk of Nālandā. *Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa bzhi'i chos skor* (New Delhi:
Chophel Legdan, 1973), p. 171, ll. 4–5: *miṅ du yaṅ bhu su ku zhes grags la*

Similar issues arise from sections XII and XIII. Section XII and the first part of XIII run as follows:

XII.   *pūrvakṛtaṃ sūtrasamuccayaṃ śikṣāsamuccayaṃ bodhicaryā-*
         vatārākhyaṃ granthatrayam astīti cetasi kṛtvā siṃhāsanagataḥ
         prāha kim ārṣaṃ paṭhāmi arthārṣaṃ vā ‖

XII.   *mdo-sde kun-las btus-pa daṅ | bslab-pa kun-las btus-pa daṅ | byaṅ-*
         chub spyod-pa la ’jug-pa źes gźuṅ-gsum bdag-gis byas yod-do ‖ de-
         la spyod-pa la ’jug-pa gdon-par ’os źes bsams-nas gsuṅs-te draṅ-
         soṅ-gis gsuṅs-pa ’am | de’i-rjes las byuṅ-ba gaṅ gdon |

XIII.   *tatra ṛṣiḥ paramārthajñānavān ṛṣa gatāv ity atra auṇādikaḥ kviḥ*
         ṛṣiṇā jinena proktam ārṣaṃ nanu prajñāpāramitādau subhūtyādi-
         deśitaṃ katham ārṣaṃ ity atrocyate yuvarājāryamaitreyeṇa ‖

XIII.   *don-dam rtog-pa ni draṅ-soṅ-ṅo ‖ des mdzad-pa gsuṅ-rab-bo ‖ de-la*
         brten-nas gźan-gyi bya-ba de rjes-las byuṅ-ba’o ‖ ’phags-pa byams-
         pas de gsuṅs-pa |

Having compared the two versions of the text, de Jong (1975, p. 177) states, “Il est évident que les textes sanskrit et tibétain doivent remonter au même texte original. Les différences entre les deux versions dans les sections XIII et XIV sont dûes à des additions. Le texte sanskrit a ajouté une phrase sur l’étymologie de ṛṣi (ṛṣī gatāv ity atra auṇādikaḥ kin) et une référence à l’enseignement de Subhūti: nanu prajñāpāramitādau subhūtyādideśitaṃ katham ārṣam ‘Comment ce qui a été enseigné par Subhūti dans la Prajñāpāramitā, etc. peut-il être *ārṣa*?’ Le passage précédent explique qu’*ārṣa* est ce qui est dit par le *ṛṣi*, i.e. le *jina*.” However, these “additions” are integral to the two versions of the text themselves. The Sanskrit version of section XIII from *nanu* through *katham ārṣam* has been translated by de Jong above. As for the first part, de Jong (1975, p. 174, n. 28), acknowledging a note from Professor Y. Ojihara, points out that one should read *ṛṣī gatāv ity atra auṇādikaḥ kin*.

The *Daśapādyuṇādivṛtti* (DPU) at 1.48 *igupadhāt kit* states *ṛṣī gatau tau°* / *ṛṣatīti ṛṣiḥ muniḥ* / *karttā*, “the sixth-class [verbal root] *ṛṣ*

----

de ni za nyal chags gsum pa zhes bya’o. Cf. Bengali *bhōs* “fool”; Kumaunī *bhus* “foolish, wild, uncivilized, rude” (CDIAL §9545).

[occurs] when [the sense of] *gati* 'going' [is to be denoted];[13] 'he moves (*ṛṣati*)', hence [he is called] *ṛṣi*, [that is to say,] a sage, [in the sense of the] agent [of the act of moving]."[14] One is now in a position to translate the first part of section XIII: "In this respect, a *ṛṣi* is someone who possesses knowledge (*jñāna*) of the supreme meaning, [through the addition of] the *uṇādi* suffix *kit* to [the verbal root] *ṛṣ* [which occurs] when [the sense of] *gati* 'going' [is to be denoted], [and] *ārṣam* [is formed according to the analysis]: promulgated by a *ṛṣi*, [that is to say,] the Jina."

The Tibetan version of section XIII begins: *don-dam rtog-pa ni draṅ-soṅ-ṅo*, "a *ṛṣi* is someone who has knowledge of the supreme meaning". A *ṛṣi* is thus said to possess knowledge of the supreme meaning in both the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions. The explanation of the term *ṛṣi* as a *kṛt* or primary derivation from the root *ṛṣ* in the sense of *gati* "a going" clearly draws on the traditional hermeneutic rule *sarve gatyarthā jñānārthāḥ* which states that all words that mean "move" also mean "know". Just as the term *ārṣa* is explained in the Sanskrit version of section XIII by the phrase *ṛṣiṇā jinena proktam ārṣam*, it is explained in the Tibetan version of section XII: *draṅ-soṅ-gis gsuṅs-pa*, "that which has been proclaimed by a *ṛṣi*". At work here is a rule from Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. A 4.1.83 *prāg dīvyato 'ṇ* teaches that the *taddhita* suffix *aṆ* (*-á* with *vṛddhi* strengthening of the first vowel) is added under meaning conditions given in rules up to rule A 4.4.2 *tena dīvyati khanati jayati jitam*. That is to say, A 4.1.83 is a general rule (*utsarga*) which teaches the addition of *aṆ* unless it is blocked by some other suffix under conditions specified by a special rule (*apavāda*). A 4.3.101 *tena proktam* then teaches the addition of *aṆ* in the sense "promulgated by him", hence *ārṣa* in the sense of "promulgated by a *ṛṣi*".

---

[13]The Pāṇinīya *dhātupāṭha* 6.7.

[14]Incidentally, the Tibetan rendering of *ṛṣi* as *draṅ-soṅ*, or, more commonly, *draṅ-sroṅ* (*draṅ-po* "straight", *soṅ* "became, turned"; *sroṅ-pa* "to make straight, straighten [the body]") is based on the Sanskrit *nirvacana ṛjuḥ śete* "he sits straight".

Let me finally turn to the form *arthārṣa* met with in the Sanskrit version of section XII,   which ends: *prāha kim ārṣaṃ paṭhāmi arthārṣaṃ vā*, "He says, 'Shall I recite *ārṣam* or *arthārṣam*?' " Section XIII quotes a verse from the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, which de Jong (1975, p. 178) points out "ne fait pas de distinction entre *ārṣa* et *arthārṣa* (Tib. de-rjes las byuṅ-ba), mais dit que tout ce qui est dit en conformité avec certaines conditions est *ārṣam iva*". Pointing out that Edgerton (BHSD) has identified the reading *ārṣa* in Wogihara's edition of the *Bodhi-sattvabhūmi* as a corruption of *ārṣabha*, de Jong goes on to say (1975, p. 178), "Le mot *ārṣa* se rencontre dans le Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra (XVIII.31): *ārṣaś ca deśanādharmo*, mais le commentaire ne l'explique pas. Il se peut très bien que le mot *arthārṣa* soit corrompu mais la version tibétaine qui en donne une traduction libre ne permet pas de le corriger. On ne retrouve la distinction entre *ārṣa* et *arthārṣa* ni chez Bu-ston ni chez Tāranātha. … Pour conclure cette discussion signalons encore que dans section XV, le texte sanskrit a *arthārṣam* mais la version tibétaine *gźan-pa = anyad*."

The latter part of the Tibetan version of section XII runs as follows: *de-la spyod-pa la 'jug-pa gdon-par 'os źes bsams-nas gsuṅs-te draṅ-soṅ-gis gsuṅs-pa 'am | de'i-rjes las byuṅ-ba gaṅ gdon*, "He says, 'Shall I recite that which has been proclaimed by a *ṛṣi* or that which has come after that [which has been proclaimed by a *ṛṣi*]?' " The Tibetan trans-lator has clearly had the reading *anvārṣam* rather than *arthārṣam*. That is to say, *anvārṣam* according to the analysis *draṅ-soṅ-gis gsuṅs-pa'i-rjes las byuṅ-ba*, "that which has come after that which has been proclaimed by a *ṛṣi*", *rjes las byuṅ-ba* rendering *anugata*, which is an attested interpretation of *anu* (e.g. Sadd 883,14: *anu*saddo anugate; or, Sadd 883,18: tattha anugate anveti). The proposal of *anvārṣam* for what the Tibetan translates is appealing also because it provides a ready explanation of the corruption through similarity of the conjuncts *nvā* and *rthā* in post-Gupta scripts which indicate pre-consonantal *r* as a horizontal stroke below the head-line added to the left side of the following letter. This, of course, does not necessarily make *anvārṣam*

the correct reading, and I am held back from accepting that it was by the absence of citations of other occurrences of the word. The passage of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* referred to above distinguishes between *ārṣam*, what is not *ārṣam* (*viparītam anyathā*) and what is *ārṣa*-like (*ārṣam iva*) and therefore acceptable teaching. An example of the last would be the *subhūtyādideśitam*. To accept *anvārṣam* in that sense one would need examples of other *anu*-words with this of the same kind. Otherwise I would be inclined to think that *anvārṣam* might be a corruption of *anārṣam*. The latter is congruent with the Tibetan *gźan* (*anyad = anārṣam*) of XV.

Through the instances presented above, I have tried to highlight that some of the specific techniques and conventions applied by indigenous commentators and translators often consist of linguistic and hermen-eutical devices rooted in the Sanskrit traditions of *vyākaraṇa* and *nirvacanaśāstra*, and that a knowledge of these disciplines can be of importance for a full understanding of Buddhist texts. These were the disciplines Buddhist commentators and translators were versed in, disciplines we might in the end simply call philology.

<div style="text-align: right">

E.G. Kahrs
University of Cambridge

</div>

ABBREVIATIONS

A   Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Reference is to O. Böhtlingk, ed., *Pâṇini's Grammatik, herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedene Indices versehen*. Leipzig: Haessel, 1887

AK   Vasubandhu, *Abhidharmakośa*(-*bhāṣya*), Vol. I. Edited with the *Sphuṭārthā* commentary of Yaśomitra by Swami Dwarikadas Shastri. Bauddha Bharati Series 5. Varanasi: Bauddha Bharati, 1970

CDIAL   R.L. Turner, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962–1969

CMP   Ācārya Āryadeva, *Caryāmelāpakapradīpam*. Edited by Janardan Shastri Pandey. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 22. Sarnath, Varanasi: Rare Buddhist Texts Research Project, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2000

DPU   Uṇādisūtras in the *daśapādī* recension. Reference is to Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, ed., *Daśapādyuṇādivṛtti*. Princess of Wales Sarasvati Bhavana Texts Series 81, Benares: Government Sanskrit College, 1943

MW   Monier Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit–English Dictionary*. Oxford, 1899

Nir   Yāska, *Nirukta*. Reference is to L. Sarup, ed., *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta: The Oldest Indian Treatise on Etymology, Philology, and Semantics. Sanskrit Text*. Lahore: University of the Panjab, 1927

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Caillat, C., 1971. "Note préliminaire" in Y. Ojihara, "Un chapitre de la *Saddanīti* comparé aux données pâṇinénnes", *JA* 259, pp. 83–97

Cone, M., 2001. *A Dictionary of Pāli: Part I*, Oxford: Pali Text Society

von Hinüber, O., 1978. "On the tradition of Pāli texts in India, Ceylon and Burma". In *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries*, edited by H. Bechert. *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* (Philologisch-historische Klasse, III.108), pp. 55–57

de Jong, J.W., 1975. "La légende de Śāntideva", *IIJ* 16, pp. 161–82

——— 1978. "Textcritical notes on the Prasannapadā", *IIJ* 20, pp. 25–59

Kahrs, E.G., 1992. "Exploring the *Saddanīti*", *JPTS* XVII, 1–212

La Vallée Poussin, L. de, 1903–13. *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās* (*Mādhyamika-sūtras*) *de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā commentaire de Candrakīrti* (*Bibliotheca Buddhica* IV), Saint Petersburg

Norman, K.R., 1983. *Pāli Literature.* A History of Indian Literature, Vol. VII, fasc. 2, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz

—— 1997. *A Philological Approach to Buddhism.* The Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai Lectures 1994. The Buddhist Forum, Vol. V. London: School of Oriental and African Studies; reprinted, Pali Text Society, 2006

Pezzali, Amalia, 1968. *Śāntideva, mystique bouddhiste des VIIe et VIIIe siècles*. Firenze: Vallecchi Editore

Renou, L., 1951. "Sur quelques formations sanskrites en *-ti-*", *Vāk* 1, 1–4

Smith, H., ed., 1928–30. *Saddanīti*: *la grammaire palie d'Aggavaṃsa*: I *Pada-mālā*, II *Dhātumālā*, III *Suttamālā*, Lund: Gleerup; reprinted, Pali Text Society, 2001