PHILOLOGY

Text Structure and Rule Ordering in the First Tibetan Grammatical Treatise

ROY ANDREW MILLER

1.1 The contemporary worker in Tibetan studies will surely have no difficulty in associating his or her field of specialization with one of the areas in our subject first explored, or in some way or another significantly touched upon, by the Hungarian pioneer whose bicentenary we have come together to celebrate during these meetings here in Bloomington. Many of the papers to be read today and tomorrow will—as for example even the titles of several of the scheduled contributions indicate—have specific reference to one or another of Csoma de Kőrös' early studies. The absence of an overt reference to Csoma or to his work in the title of our own paper should, however, by no means be taken to indicate a lack of specific relation to the Hungarian pioneer's accomplishments; we have here to deal with the beginnings of grammatical analysis and description, and indeed with the beginnings of linguistic science itself within the Tibetan culture; and in such a context a gathering such as this hardly needs, we believe, an overt reminder that Europe's, and the West's, first important introduction to the texts with which we are here concerned is also to be found among Csoma's first accounts of what he dubbed "the historical and grammatical works to be encountered in Tibet. "[1]

1.2. By the 'First (and Second) Tibetan Grammatical Treatises' we make specific reference to the *Sum-cu-pa* (= *SCP*) and *Rtags-kyi hjug-pa* (= *RKHP*), resp., two early linguistic texts that have already been the subject of considerable study in the West and in Japan,[2] and that in Tibetan scholastic tradition have universally been attributed to 'Thon-mi sambhoṭa' in his quasi-mythic role as inventor of the Tibetan script and founder of Tibetan literary culture.[3] For our part, it is probably useful to sum up at the outset our present position on the question of the historicity of these two texts, even without going into the details of the question, in order to provide the gist of the historical-philological background necessary for the remainder of this paper.

In short, we presently hold that (a) both the *SCP* and the *RKHP* are, exactly as the Tibetan tradition has always asserted, extremely old, even ancient texts, although we can no longer associate ourselves with that same tradition in ascribing both to a single historical individual or to a single point in historical time; (b) the *SCP* and the *RKHP*, although both old, are in part at least

originally of different dates, a fact obscured but not completely concealed by editorial work to which both of our received texts have been subjected with a view to harmonizing the details of the two; from this effort at editorial harmonization also date the several cross-references that today appear to link together our received texts of these two treatises; (c) compared with the *SCP*, the *RKHP* is the more homogenous of the two, its content and linguistic-descriptive approach showing that, even in the somewhat late harmonized form in which we now have this text, it is nevertheless the product more or less of a single fairly narrow time span; but within the *SCP* the survivals of several chronologically disparate text strata are still plainly visible, particularly *SCP* śl. 8, which describes an early form of Old Tibetan somewhat prior to the later canonical Written Tibetan.[4]

In this fashion, our present view of the *SCP* and *RKHP*, growing out of recent Western and Japanese scholarship on these two texts, does not at all contradict the principal elements of the Tibetan historical tradition concerning these texts; in particular it affirms that tradition's cardinal allegation of the texts' antiquity; but it does go over and beyond the tradition in its reconstruction of the pre-history of these texts, and in its recovery of at least a portion of their subsequent vicissitudes, both topics that were for one reason or another closed books to the Tibetan tradition, including, oddly enough, the tradition of the historians, who must in all candor today be admitted to have known rather less about these things than we might otherwise have expected.[5]

1.3.1 The present contribution takes as givens a number of preliminary findings relating to the structure and the descriptive-analytic, i.e. the linguistic techniques of the *SCP* initially sketched in *LDT*; this was the first occasion in the literature for attention to be drawn to any of the issues that will be elaborated in the present paper. *LDT* is particularly relevant for its suggestion that the *SCP* essentially consists of three major parts ('I', 'II', and 'III', cf. *LDT* passim., but especially at §3.1.2), a basic proposition that underlies most of the treatment of this text in the present contribution.

1.3.2 The study of these two early Tibetan grammatical treatises has hardly been distinguished, in recent years, either by the frequency or by the quality of the secondary literature devoted to it; indeed, much precious time and effort have necessarily had to be lavished on refuting uninformed and misleading contributions that otherwise have threatened to set our field back, rather than to advance it (e.g., Yamaguchi Zuihō 1976, refuted in *GTR* and *LDT*).

Useful and positive contributions to our understanding of the early grammatical tradition in Tibet, particularly contributions that genuinely facilitate our study of the *SCP* and *RKHP*, are therefore always more than welcome if only because, ever since the short-lived flurry of activity in this field initiated by Jacques Bacot and Johannes Schubert in the late 1920s, they remain so exceedingly rare: but such contributions are due a particularly warm welcome

when, as in the case of two recent papers by Nils Simonsson 1982a, 1982b, they not only add greatly to our comprehension of these always cryptic and enigmatic texts, but at the same time also point the way toward new methods and approaches for our study that will surely contribute greatly to the future solution of still other, perhaps today even still unformulated, problems in these texts.

Quite apart from those specific issues in the interpretation of *RKHP* śl. 32 upon which his contributions throw significant light, Simonsson's two recent papers are of great importance for our studies because of the attention that they focus upon a number of methodological issues in the study—not to mention in the translation!—of these texts, and particularly because of the clarity with which their author first identifies, then expresses himself upon, a number of these questions.

First place among these points we would assign to Simonsson's succinct evaluation of the dangers inherent in blindly following the later interpretations of the Tibetan schools in our own readings of these two early texts. No one, of course, is ever about to suggest that unilaterally turning our backs upon everything that the accumulative weight of the Tibetan scholastic tradition has to teach us about the meaning of these or of any other early texts would be other than sheer, fruitless folly. We must always acquaint ourselves with what the culture itself out of which our texts grew, and the culture which in turn these same texts themselves fructified, has to tell us about what our texts mean. But to do this is by no means the same as to treat the *SCP* and *RKHP* as if they were mere code-books or darkly enciphered messages, i.e. not really texts at all but puzzles or ciphers, meaningless sequences of linguistic xs and ys that could only be decoded by consulting the deciphering lore of the later lamas. For all the difficulty of their terse, enigmatic style of statement, the *SCP* and *RKHP* are both texts; and texts can, moreover must, be read as texts. Simonsson scores this first point with admirable brevity: "Like Pāṇini's sūtras the Tibetan sūtras are written in an extremely laconic style which makes them very difficult to interpret, but easy to distort by commentators who cherish opinions of their own" (1982b.286). Put in another way, at the same time that we consult the later commentators, we must always be on guard against the distortions that they may have introduced in the course of "cherish[ing] opinions of their own". Nor need it be pointed out at length that such distortions generally make themselves most obvious when, as so frequently proves to be the case, accommodation of the "cherished opinions" of the later commentators would require us to fly directly in the face of the plain sense, and especially of the grammar, syntax, and lexical meanings, of the original early texts themselves.

Second, Simonsson demonstrates, both by the example of his own careful exegesis of *SCP* śl. 1 and of *RKHP* śl. 32, as well as by his critical evaluation

of previous renderings of these passages, the almost awesome responsibility necessarily involved in any attempt to translate either selections from, or the entire text of, either work.

Most important to understand in this connection is that no lack of gratitude for the enormous labors of pioneers in this field, such as Bacot or Schubert, is involved in our critical evaluation of their early efforts. We could hardly work at all without the benefit of the earlier studies, and yet, as Simonsson deftly points out, too often one or another of the early translators has simply ''not cared to translate this [or that] word, this resulting in his interpretation of the whole grammar turning out practically meaningless'' (1982b.288). So much for sins of omission; one scarcely need dwell upon the even more disastrous results obtained when, as frequently, the earlier translators have not avoided difficult words and terms, but instead have replaced them outright with quite incongruent, when not totally irrelevant, Western school-grammar categories.

Third, not only in precept but also by example Simonsson has clearly demonstrated the only method actually available to us for solving the problems presented by these two early grammatical treatises from Tibet—not the uncritical rote replication of the ''cherished opinions'' of the later commentators, but the painstaking philological exploration *ab initio* of virtually every technical term in the *SCP* and the *RKHP*—in the course of which we must constantly balance the considerations of ''the Buddhist philosophical speculation'' on the one hand with ''the Pāṇinian tradition'' of the Indic *vyākaraṇa* on the other (1982a.537, but also passim.). This point is hardly a new one in Simonsson's work: it was originally made with equal force in his *ITS*, p. 242 (cf. 1982a.543); but the passage of nearly three decades has not in the least diminished its impact.

Fourth, and finally, Simonsson puts us even further in his debt by deftly placing into a rational and reasonable scientific perspective the still vexing question of the historicity of Thon-mi Sambhoṭa, the putative author of these texts: ''Whether Thon-mi Sambhoṭa lived in the seventh century A.D. or earlier, or even is legendary, is scarcely of importance for us here. It is important, however, that two grammatical treatises do exist, attributed to a person of that name, and that these treatises, the sūtras,[6] have been in the center of Tibetan grammatical thinking for many hundreds of years'' (1982b.286). This point is extremely well taken; but at the same time, it ought not discourage us from continuing to seek out, whenever possible, documentable text-parallels, if not text-sources, in both the Indic and the Tibetan grammatical tradition, for specific *SCP* and *RKHP* passages, particularly for a number of especially enigmatic passages in these two texts: frequently (as e.g. in the case of *SCP* śl. 12, see §3.3.5 *infra*) the identification of such independent textual testimony not only throws light upon the dating of one or more passages in the grammatical treatises, but also provides a reliable method for penetrating the

veil of distortions with which the later commentators have clouded over our comprehension of many important elements in the early Tibetan grammatical tradition.

1.3.3 Heartening also to those concerned with the study of these early texts from Tibet are the many indications, increasingly to hand, showing how our studies, in their own and necessarily limited fashion, frequently recapitulate not only much of the practical method but also a good deal of the intellectual impetus that presently propels the van for Indic grammatical studies proper, especially Pāṇinian researches. This is a development that was only to be anticipated, particularly in view of the intimate relationship between the early Tibetan grammatical works and the *vyākaraṇa* that has, *inter alia*, most recently been emphasized *de novo* in both of Simonsson's new contributions (but particularly 1982a *passim.*, and 544), where he demonstrates that even "in spite of the fact that [a specific] illustrating example . . . is a typically Buddhist one, we shall have to turn to the Pāṇinian tradition in order to understand" it.

It would be folly to assert, or even to imply, that anything in the Tibetan grammatical tradition ever approached Pāṇinian standards of subtlety and sophistication. But even though the tradition is thus, in a sense, far from Pāṇinian, it is still indubitably Indic, and so it must always be approached from the point of view of the Indic grammarians and their views.

We have already had occasion to explore one aspect of this Tibetan recapitulation of the trend of Pāṇinian studies: the denigration that the *SCP* (and its author[s]) have had to endure on the part of certain modern students of this text is neatly paralleled by the abuse that e.g. Whitney once was short-sighted enough to heap upon Pāṇini himself: but "before we . . . similarly make the mistake of assuming that the author(s) of the *SCP* were not sensible, and that this text abounds in errors, and that we are entitled to reject it outright merely because it does not agree with our concept of what it should be or say, we will do well to remember how absurd Whitney's imprecations strike the Indologist—as well as any serious linguist—today" (*LDT* §3.3).

Another of the several directions along which our Tibetan linguistic studies frequently display almost startling parallels with the path of recent Pāṇinian researches concerns the manner in which much of the later Tibetan tradition for reading our texts has long been characterized, to an overgenerous degree, by what we may term 'the unwarranted presumption of synonymity'; it was only to be expected that when, in the late 1920's, Western scholarship first fitfully directed its energies toward these sources, it too would inherit a large amount of this gratuitous postulation. The technique involved in this presumption of synonymity is highly seductive: unfortunately also it is almost always misleading, when it is not simply incorrect.

When one or the other of these two ancient grammatical texts opts for two (or more) distinct terms or expressions for a linguistic entity that appears to us today (or even to the lamas of the schools a few hundred or so years ago) to be pretty much one and the same, the gratuitous presumption of synonymity urges us simply to sweep all this under the rug, by assuming that terms x, y, z . . . n are, in such cases, nothing more than redundant synonyms employed in elegant variation, i.e. that they 'all mean the same thing'.

Even on the face of the matter, this is generally highly unlikely, particularly when we keep in mind the terse, succinct style of both the *SCP* and the *RKHP*. One can hardly imagine a literary form less hospitable to elegant variation than the spare, concise language of these two texts. Synonymity also becomes increasingly improbable when we consider the issue in the light of recent developments in Pāṇinian studies, to which this portion of our remarks has immediate reference—developments usefully summed up in Deshpande 1984, reviewing Kiparsky 1979. As Deshpande describes the situation, "[w]ith some 2500 years of Pāṇinian commentators and their modern followers believing that [terms x, y, and z] are synonyms, one must admire K[iparsky]'s courage in starting with the hypothesis that each term may denote a different kind of option, and also appreciate his originality in seeking valid methods to prove his hypothesis. . . . if one is to disagree with [the commentators], then one cannot rely on the same old ways of justifying one's interpretations. One must find ways which are totally independent of the tradition, and at the same time these must be convincing and ingenious." In a word, Kiparsky has sought to detect—and to document!—differences in Pāṇini's description and analysis in cases "where the entire tradition of Pāṇinian grammarians has been able to find no difference in meaning". In the process he has not only evolved "significant methodological, historical, and substantive implications for future research," he has also documented that "his basic claim seems to be better justified than the alternatives of blindly clinging to the traditional belief that these [lexically different] terms mean the same" (Deshpande 1984.162, 161, 163).

In other words, by abandoning the gratuitous assumption of synonymity, Kiparsky has gotten us closer to the original sense of his texts. Our texts too, though much later in time, and originating in quite a different country and language, and also based upon linguistic description and analysis of far less sophistication and intricacy than those underlying Kiparsky's corpus, are nevertheless part and parcel of the same overall Indic tradition as that in which Kiparsky works. Not only does it thus behoove us to turn constantly to the Pāṇinian, resp. the Indic, grammatical tradition in order to understand our texts, as Simonsson stresses; we are also generally well advised to approach that tradition, and our texts, whenever possible in terms of the methodological approach exemplified by Kiparsky on putative synonymity.

Above everything else, this means constantly being on the alert against the gratuitous assumption of synonymity: whenever the Tibetan commentators (or Western scholars uncritically parroting their views) insist that terminological diversity in the *SCP* and *RKHP* is meaningless ("*x*, *y*, *z* . . . *n* all merely mean the same thing"), we must always be prepared at least to consider the possibility that each different term in the original may instead well have meant something different. And, as we hope to illustrate in the present contribution through specific illustrations drawn from the *SCP*, considering the issue in this fashion frequently throws new light on the sense as well as on the implications of this ancient linguistic text, light that is as welcome as it is long overdue.

Also displaying impressive parallels to many of the questions raised by these Tibetan grammatical studies are a number of the issues treated with impressive power of conviction by Cardona in his account of the method of description of the Indic grammarians as reflected in the so-called *Śiva-sūtras* of Pāṇini's grammar (Cardona 1969). The first six ślokas (in the conventional numbering[7]) of the *SCP* also constitute, in effect, a *śiva-sūtra*-like preliminary to the grammar-proper of this treatise (*LDT* §3.1.2 with note 44); and as a consequence there is much for our studies to learn from Cardona's explication of these fourteen preliminary Pāṇinian *sūtras*, particularly in his stress on the apparently diverse but actually unitary function of the various aspects of these passages, i.e. for "the formation of *pratyāhāras* to be used in rules", his emphasis upon the way in which "Pāṇini's grammar is thematically divisible into several main parts", and especially his identification and reconstruction of his so-called *L-Pāṇini* as "a classification of sound which must be considered pre-Pāṇinian" (Cardona 1969.12, 3, 9). Each of these parts of Cardona's study has much to teach us about how we may most usefully approach our own texts, and in what follows we shall have more than one occasion for implementing his method and approach in terms of our rather less involved materials.

2. To sum up, then, our point of departure for the present study of the *SCP*, it is actually necessary to recapitulate only two basic facts that by now have been established about this text. Both are exceedingly simple, but by the same token, both also are exceedingly important. The *SCP* is old, and it is a text, i.e. it is an old text.

Upon each of these two discrete terms, as well as upon the sum total implied in their collocation above, depend a number of working hypotheses that we shall attempt to implement in §3 *infra*; but first it is necessary to elaborate upon some of the principal implications of these categorizations.

2.1 The *SCP* is old. This holds valid and remains significant almost without regard for the still partly unresolved questions of its date and authorship, cf. Simonsson 1982b.286 (already cited *supra*, 1.3.2). Indeed, one wonders if

we actually possess any original Tibetan literary composition, i.e. texts not translations from Indic or other originals, that are older than the *SCP*, or at least older than the now partially lost Old Tibetan *Urtext* that may be demonstrated to underlie certain portions of the received-text *SCP* (cf. the discussions of *SCP* śl. 8 in *LDT* and *GTR*, passim.).

Because the *SCP* is old, it naturally follows that we must approach the problems of its meaning (not to mention those of its translation) with all due regard for the views of the later Tibetan scholastic tradition in which this treatise has been continually transmitted and studied, probably for *ca.* a thousand years. In the same way, students of Pāṇini must necessarily work carefully through the vast body of lore and learning of which Kātyāyana and Patañjali represent only the peak of a great mountain of erudition. But because the *SCP* is old, far older without question than any of the subsequent commentators upon it, we must not repeat the fatal methodological error of confusing the respect and attention that are properly due the lore of the later lamas with the equally proper critical philological scrutiny that are due this text by reason of its antiquity. It would be absurd to claim that we "know more than the lamas" on this or any other Tibetological topic; but it would be equally absurd not to be willing to recognize, and to admit, that we may very well know different things than they did, and do, particularly when text-critical techniques unknown to them permit us to work in the light of earlier, recovered (resp. restored) stages of text history not at their disposal. Cardona has put this point too extremely well: " . . . I am obviously indebted to the Indian commentators . . . . One cannot help but have great admiration for the erudition and acumen of commentators . . . , and their comments have served both to help in understanding the grammar and to point up problems. Careful attention to commentatorial statements does not, of course, imply blind acceptance of them all" (1969.3).

Previous studies of the *SCP* and *RKHP* have in fact all too frequently confused "careful attention to commentatorial statements" such as those to be found in the magisterial work of the Mahāpaṇḍita of Situ with blind acceptance of them all. The great Situ commentary on the first two grammatical treatises is, it hardly need be stressed, the most comprehensive and throroughgoing guide that we possess for our study of these texts; it is also by that same token liable to be the most dangerous, because of its author's overpowering compulsion to explain everything in the texts in terms of a single and unilinear, if not simplistic, system. In the process, as we shall see in particular detail at §3.1.3 *infra*, the Mahāpaṇḍita of Situ effectively erases much of the overt philological evidence for more than a few significant distinctive categories that the *SCP* original establishes in terms of its own linguistic analysis and descriptive techniques; and this tendency of this all-important commentator was one that almost literally snowballed in the hands of the Western students

and translators. When, as frequently, we find the Tibetan commentators violating the grammar of the language itself in the process of 'explaining' the statements of the *SCP* (e.g. on śl. 12, §3.3.5 *infra*), or even at times making unsupported claims for lexical meanings otherwise totally unattested (e.g. §3.3.5 *infra* on *tshig*), it is incumbent upon us to look at their statements with more than ordinary caution—all the more so when, as also all too frequently is the case, we detect them effectively rewriting the original in order to make it say something that it plainly does not, and never did, say (e.g. anent *SCP* 8, in *LDT* and *GTR*, passim.). This we can accomplish only by looking carefully once more at the text itself: what the later commentators claim that it says is never irrelevant, but in the final analysis only what the text itself actually proves to say, in and of itself, is actually significant. When all is said and done, the text must—and almost always can—speak for itself.

2.2 The *SCP* is a text. From this fact also there depend a number of imperatives that are virtually categorical for its study. Most of these considerations are closely interrelated with those just discussed: once we determine to let the *SCP* speak by, of, and for itself, by reason of its antiquity, we will no longer be tempted toward overreliance upon the traditional scholastics who have all too frequently regarded it, not as a text, but as a code or a cipher—a series of intrinsically meaningless, or at the least always obscure, statements into which we must somehow insert meaning, as one inserts meaning in the process of deciphering or decoding an arbitrary system of secret writing. To follow the Tibetan commentators blindly into this gambit is to do them and their erudition less justice than their often considerable achievements and commendable energy normally deserve.

Over and above these considerations, the basic fact of the essential textuality of the *SCP* in its turn imposes at least three consequential contingencies upon our studies. Since the *SCP* is a text, it has internal structure—by definition, since all texts do. Since it is a text, it not only has structure, it also has rule ordering, of which we shall have more to say below, but which for the moment may adequately be understood as directing attention to the fact that the statements of the *SCP* occur in a certain and fixed, but not necessarily arbitrary order *vis-à-vis* one another. Part and parcel of the fact of textual structure is that, as a consequence, individual parts of the whole stand in a fore or aft relation to one another; and it will be one of the particular tasks of §3 *infra* to study and if possible explain the implications of this ordering of its rules for a better understanding of the linguistic analysis inherent in the *SCP*. Finally, since the *SCP* is a text, it has its own history. A text is not an abstraction (though it may of course deal with more than one variety of abstraction): it is an entity that exists in time, and hence it has history—but this lasts brings us back full circle to §2.1 *supra*, i.e. to the essential fact that the *SCP* is old.

2.2.1. The internal structure of the *SCP* is a concept carefully to be distinguished from the various varieties of extrinsic structures, or structurings, that the later commentators have frequently imposed upon it, in their well-intentioned but not always equally well-informed attempts at explication. A parallel may very well be drawn with the concept of 'grammar' in the abstract. The internal structure of the text is the only relevant framework in terms of which the text may either be described or explained, even though that framework is frequently anything but obvious, and hence frequently must itself be discovered in the process of our analytic study of the text. In this it provides a precise parallel to the grammar of any language, in the larger sense of that term, understanding grammar as that which exists in and as part of any given language, where it awaits discovery by the linguist. In these same terms, the generally irrelevant extrinsic structuring that the commentators would impose upon the text from the outside parallels, e.g., the Greek- and Latin-based European grammars that inept linguists still frequently attempt to foist off upon languages of totally different structures. If our understanding of either is to advance, the structure of a text, like the structure of a language, must always be left to speak for itself.

Probably the most striking examples of this variety of largely irrelevant extrinsically-imposed structuring are provided by the two commentaries translated by Schubert, the late recasting by Rol-paḥi rdo-rje (1717-1786) of the relatively early work by Dharmapālabhadra, Chos-skyoñ-bzañ-po (1441-1528),[8] and the very late commentary of Dbyañs-can grub-paḥi rdo-rje.[9] In both instances, the extrinsic structurings that these commentators imposed upon the *SCP* have if anything been thrown into larger-than-life relief by Schubert's painstakingly literal translations, which leave most of the technical terminology in Tibetan, while at the same time maneuvering the commentators' systems of number-marked extrinsic structurings into a position of even greater visibility than that which they enjoy in the originals that Schubert was rendering. The result is that the student of Schubert's translations, valuable though they still are, and indeed the remarkable accomplishments that they were for their time, will most likely be inclined to believe that the extrinsic structurings which he elevated to such a prominent place in his versions are of cardinal importance for an understanding of the *SCP* itself (which is true enough, but not in the sense in which the reader of Schubert's translations will take it), and also that these extrinsic structurings somehow reflect the internal structure of the *SCP* itself (which is not true at all, in any sense).

The net of extrinsic structurings that the great commentary of the Mahāpaṇḍita of Situ throws about both these two early treatises is at once rather more sophisticated than anything known until his time, and by that same token rather more difficult to evaluate; it also has, as we might expect from its author's enormous evidence of erudition, much to teach us today, de-

spite the equally obvious necessity for never following it blindly. Most convenient for inspecting the extrinsic structurings involved in the Situ commentary is the form in which its schema is recast in the concise epitome of Dharmabhadra; and the schema of this epitome may in turn most usefully be consulted in the meticulous and always conscientious translation of Inaba,[10] especially in his overall presentation of pp. 314-16. This, along with Inaba's Japanese translation, p. 317 ff., is particularly convenient for confronting with Inaba's critically edited text of the Dharmabhadra epitome of the *SCP*, in his *Furoku*, pp. 1-44; the reader will wish to compare both with the proposal in §2.3 *infra* for a thematic division of the *SCP* (in the sense of Cardona 1969.3) into several parts according to the text's internal marking of its own internal structure. These, it will be found, do not always or necessarily differ too strikingly from the extrinsic structurings imposed by the Situ commentary; but by the same taken, the two also do not always coincide by any means; and when they do not, their lack of congruence is frequently of critical value for an understanding of our text.

For example, we shall see below (and we have already discussed in *LDT* in some detail) how *SCP* śls. 1-6 constitute a *śiva-sūtra*-like prolegomenon to the *SCP*, and we have also touched upon the internal relationship of these six ślokas among themselves (a relationship further detailed in §2.3 *infra*). This is to be contrasted with the Situ commentary's ordering of these six: the Mahāpaṇḍita takes śls. 1-6 together as a set, to be sure, but he also places śl. 1 on one level as coeval with śls. 2-6 on another, an arrangement that seriously compromises our understanding of the grammatical-analytic functions of the statements concerned. Similarly with the second major portion of the *SCP* (our 'II'); here the Mahāpaṇḍita resolutely imposes an extrinsic ordering on śls. 7-23 that would see in śls. 7-17 "eight particles and case suffixes undergoing morphophonemic alternation" (*rjes-hug la ltos-paḥi phrad rnam-dbye . . . brgyad*, text ed. Inaba, p. 14, §II.A.2a, translation Inaba, p. 329, §233), as against, in śls. 19-23, "six free particles not undergoing morphophonemic alternation" (*rjes-hjug la ma-ltos-paḥi phrad rañ-dbañ-can . . . drug*, text p. 26, § II.A.2b, translation, p. 345, §260). But unexplained, indeed unmentioned, in this variety of extrinsic structuring is why, e.g., śl. 17, which treats the morphophonemically invariable vocative case marker, is found in the particular location within the *SCP* where it is, or why the terminal enclitic *-Qo* of śl. 7 (*LDT* §3.1.1 with note 42) is taught at the beginning of this section, not to mention a host of parallel problems.

2.2.2 The grammar of the *SCP*, like all grammars taking shape within the Indic tradition, is in effect a set of rules that teach the morphological formation and syntactic meanings of specific linguistic forms; but as a consequence of its structure (§2.2.1) it also follows that the statements of the text possess rule order, i.e. there are principles of basic significance to the text's descrip-

tion and analysis that determine how different parts of the grammar are inter-
related and also why certain rules appear where they do. These principles are
not always, indeed only rarely, set forth explicitly within the grammar itself;
like 'grammar' in the larger sense, these too are mostly designed in such a
fashion as to await discovery by the user of the text.

In the case of Pāṇini, the extremely covert presentation of the grammar's
rule ordering has tended to obscure much of the system until fairly recently;
even such exemplary students of the text as "Renou . . . did not discuss in de-
tail how different sections of the grammar are related and why certain rules
appear where they do" (Cardona 1976.188, §II.1.5.2a), while as late as
Fowler 1965 less informed students of the problem could still call into ques-
tion the very existence of rule order in the grammar. Now we know better. We
realize that Pāṇinian grammar not only involves order in its application of
rules, but also is built upon an extremely sophisticated system of decision-
making procedures that permit the user to select the proper rules and apply
them correctly when the order of rule application is not the same as the exter-
nal order of the rules in the grammar, while a given rule can require for its in-
terpretation information available only from rules appearing later (Cardona
1976.191; 1970 passim.; Sag 1974). So subtle indeed is this particular aspect
of the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition that even the major later Indic commen-
tators, Patañjali included, appear to have become involved in early misunder-
standings of the subject, particularly in their explanations of the proper proce-
dure to be adopted by the user where two rules in a grammar appear to con-
flict, eventually even proposing that in such a situation one must apply the
rule that will yield the desired results, i.e. that only prior knowledge of the
correct results will allow one to apply the rules correctly in the first place
(Cardona 1970, passim. but especially p.61)—hardly a high recommendation
for any grammar. Fortunately, our Tibetan treatises by no means approach
their Indic models on the score of the complexity and subtlety of their rule or-
dering; nevertheless, the concept as a whole is important to keep in mind
while reading our texts, since if even in a somewhat attenuated form it never-
theless does play a significant role in their structure and presentation.

2.2.3 Finally, because the *SCP* is a text, and because it is old, it embodies
history along with its structure and rule order. Our present text does not repre-
sent a unitary composition executed by a single hand at a single point in his-
tory: the complex background that may be recovered for our received version
of *SCP* śl. 8 (already explored in detail in *LDT* and *GTR*) is a representative
case in point. To read śl. 8 correctly, i.e. as it was intended to be understood
at the time of the incorporation of its now-lost *Urtext* into our received version
of the *SCP*, it is necessary to take cognizance of the historicity of this frag-
ment. This historicity was necessarily a closed book to the traditional Tibetan
commentators. In part this was because they lacked access to material now

available to us, e.g. in the case of śl. 8, to the Old Tibetan MSS explored in
our previous contributions cited *supra*; in part also this was because they be-
lieved that both the *SCP* and *RKHP* were the product of a single hand at a sin-
gle point in history. In part also it derives from the essentially different view
of the nature of time and history that they inherited from the Indic world view.
We shall see below (§3.3.5) how, when we are fortunate enough to have doc-
umentary attestation for what must be close to the first source for a given *SCP*
statement—a statement that otherwise we now have only in a later, re-worked
form—divergent and misleading readings are all that can result so long as we
approach the *SCP* without the benefit of historical perspective. Questions of
internal historicity are also involved in the necessary restoration of received
śl. 20 from its traditional location within the text (§ 2.3). All these issues de-
pend upon the fact that the *SCP* has its own history, which in turn comes back
full circle to the issue of the *SCP*'s textuality.

2.3 At this point it is appropriate and useful to summarize the discussion
thus far by means of a highly abbreviated but otherwise complete schematic
breakdown of the internal structure of the *SCP*, correlating the traditional
śloka numbers, which are of virtually no analytic or linguistic significance,
with the several major and minor subordinate segments into which the text it-
self divides. These traditional śloka numbers appear at the extreme left of the
schema in §2.3.1. Arabic superscripts on śloka numbers indicate the first,
second, third etc. lines of each traditional śloka. Roman 'I', 'II', and 'III',
immediately to the right of the traditional śloka numbers, and connected to
them with right-handed curved brackets (}), are the major subordinate seg-
ments already described in broad outline (*LDT* §3.1.1). Next, to the right of
these I, II, and III, is a three-fold breakdown of each of these major segments.
For both I and II, (a) cites the overt internal syntactic indicators that provide
the primary structural markings within the text itself identifying these ele-
ments. "The earlier translators [and it might be added, sometimes also
(though less frequently) the Tibetan commentators as well] customarily ig-
nored these indications of internal structure, even though they are essential to
identifying the rule-ordered presentation that is central to the text's analysis"
(*LDT* §3.1.1 and note 42). These markers are generally examples of the termi-
nal enclitic *-Qo*, but not exclusively, since *yin*, *min*, and *mi srid* also play
their parts in the system.

For both I and II, (b) further breaks down the major segment, marking sub-
sections with arabic numbers (I^1, I^2, etc., cf. *LDT* §3.1.2 and note 47). Left-
and right-directed arrows (←, →) mark non-contiguous rule ordering where,
for reasons to be discussed later, directly associated referrant and referrand
statements (e.g. śls. 13 and 8) are structurally displaced from one another.

For I, (c) briefly describes the content, resp. the linguistic function of the
portions marked with right-handed curved brackets (}). For II, (c) serves a dif-

ferent function: here it rewrites the morphophonemic-process statements of the text in succinct form, to permit easy reference to and convenient identification of the forms taught in each section except for śls. 24 and 25 where (c) is again, as with I, content-explanatory. In these rewritings the symbols + and → have their usual linguistic values; on the processes that they indicate, cf. *LDT* passim., but especially §3.1.3. The reordering proposed for the position of traditional śl. 20 to follow instead śl. 23, indicated by the vertical arrow (↓), has textual as well as internal-structural authority; see Inaba, ed. Dharmabhadra, p. 28 note 7.

Finally, for III no further subdivision is at present possible, and accordingly none is here suggested. Earlier (*SGTT*, p. 8b) we held that these ślokas constituted "a late non-grammatical accretion to the *SCP*;" now it rather appears that III, while to be sure essentially non-grammatical and non-descriptive, is nevertheless not necessarily any later than the rest of that text, and even though "this largely didactic III is thus not intimately concerned with the technical-linguistic concerns of I and II, it nevertheless contains cross-references to I (in śl. 28³), and to II (in śl. 28⁵)" (*LDT* p. 188, §3.1.2 with notes 46 and 47). III is essentially concerned with the tantristic view of the non-identity of *sgra* and *don*, roughly 'words, phrases, linguistic convention, linguistic meaning' *versus* 'propositional content, reference, referent; purpose of a speech-act, utterer's intention, etc.'— in brief, 'convention' as against 'intention' (Steinkellner 1978; Broido 1983); it remains to be studied in the necessary detail, in the light of the recent studies just cited. In the meantime, it is to be noted that this same *sgra-don* dichotomy is relevant to the reading of śl. 8 (*LDT* note 15), another indication that while III is in one sense or another an accretion to the *SCP*, it is by no means either irrelevant to or unintegrated into the remainder of the text. See table 2.3.1.

3. Of particular significance for revealing many of the critical aspects of text structure and rule ordering in the *SCP* is this treatise's presentation of the case-suffix system for the Tibetan noun, a topic that can only be approached in the light of the preliminary considerations already explored in §1 and §2 *supra*. This is also a topic that can, for the present at least, only be treated in broad outline, since its fuller exploration will eventually involve many more details than the present study can possible introduce; accordingly, §3 will emphasize in particular those problems in the *SCP*'s presentation of case that especially focus around questions of terminology in the original and of translation in later Western and Japanese studies.

3.1 *Mhvyt.*, CCXI, ed. Sakaki 4738 sqq. introduces the canonical Tibetan translations for the seven Indic cases, presenting the forms in question in the usual Indic order (I, nom., II, acc., III, instr., IV, dat., V, abl., VI, gen., VII, loc.). But unlike the *SCP*, the *Mhvyt.* does not propose Tibetan translations for the names of the cases, another of the several indications that these

2.3.1 Schema of the *SCP*

	(a)	(b)	(c)
śl. 1	. . . *ho* /	I^1	*śiva-sūtra*
2	. . . *ho* /	I^2	
3			
4 (I)		$I^3 \rightarrow$ śl. 2^1	
5		$I^4 \rightarrow$ śl. 2^2	glosses to *śiva-sūtra*
6	. . . *min* /	I^5	negative prescriptions to $I^{1\text{-}4}$
7	. . . *śes par bya* /	II^1	-(C)C*o*.
8	. . . *yin* /	II^2	*-su, -ru, -du, -na, -la*
9		II^3	*-Ci→-k(y)i*
10			
11		$II^{3\alpha}$	*-k(y)i + s*
12		$II^{3\beta}$	*-k(y)[a] + ñ*
13	. . . *ho* /	$II^{3\gamma(\leftarrow\text{śl. } 8^2)}$	*-ste*
14 (II)	. . . *yin* /	II^4	*-Cam*
15		II^5	*-nas, -las*
16	. . . *no* /		
17	. . . *yin* /	II^6	*kye !*
18		II^7	*ni*
19	. . . *ho* /		*da + ñ→dañ*
20	. . . *no* /		*d + e→de*
21			*g[a] + ñ→gañ*
22		II^8	*pulińga→p / m / b*
23			*strīliña→ma, mi*
24			deletion metris causa
25	. . . *mi srid* /	II^9	& negative prescriptions
26			
27 (III)			*don ≠ sgra*
28			
29			

two texts are hardly representative of a unitary tradition (cf. *SGTT*, p. 45-6 on
the *āli, kāli* question). Also unlike the *SCP* is the *Mhvyt.*'s overt listing of the
nominative, where the *SCP* hews more closely to the Indic norm on this score,
making no particular provision for teaching the specific forms and functions
of the nominative as such (Cardona 1974 passim. on the silence of the Indic
tradition on the notion of grammatical subjects).

The *SCP* names for the cases, or rather more precisely, the *SCP* translations
of the Indic designations for the case functions that it adopts for its descrip-
tions of the semantic-syntactic functions of the Tibetan case-suffixes, have
been studied in admirable detail by Inaba, Excursus to §5, pp. 14-15, where
he contrasts the *SCP* terms with their Indic originals as reflected, even if at
second-hand, in Pāṇini, the *Kātantra*, and the *Candra-vṛtti*. Inaba's study,
with its convenient table (p. 15), shows dramatically the way in which the
SCP draws eclectically from diverse horizons of the Indic tradition: unfortu-
nately however it does not address the cardinal issue of the absence of the *SCP*
case terms from the *Mhvyt.*, nor does it concern itself with those cases where
translations in the *Mhvyt.* suggest equivalents for the *SCP* terms that at least
ostensibly are difficult to account for within the materials that Inaba does cite
(e.g., śl. 11 *byed pa po = kāraka*, at *Mhvyt.* 4677, cf. §3.3.3 *infra*).

The *SCP* begins its account of the case-suffixes at śl. 8. This portion of the
text, as already explored in considerable detail (cf. *GTR, LDT*), is an early
fragment that described pre-Written Tibetan forms for the acc., dat., and loc.
It is noteworthy, however, that while this fragment is pre-WT, it is not of
course pre-Indic, i.e. it hews precisely to the Indic order for the Tibetan case-
suffixes that it teaches. In other words, śl. 8 is not only old, it is also an old
pre-*SCP* treatment of the Indic cases *vis-à-vis* the Tibetan case-suffixes. Most
of the special problems and issues confronted in this śloka have been explored
in the previous work cited, and may as a consequence be passed over here, ex-
cept for some necessary consideration (§3.3.1) of the term *la sgra* = **la
śabda* under which the text subsumes the five suffixes for the three cases that
it teaches. With Indic cases II, acc., IV, dat., and VII, loc., taken care of in
śl. 8, cases III, instr., V., abl., and VI, gen., are left (still in Indic order) to be
treated. But now the *SCP* departs from that Indic order, and for good reason.
To have taken up III, instr., in śl. 9 would have violated the principle of econ-
omy of statement. If the inst. had been presented immediately, and following
the Indic order, it then would not have been possible for the description to ex-
ploit the partial formal similarity between the Tibetan gen. and instr. case-suf-
fixes. But neither the gen. nor the instr. could have been incorporated into śl.
8 (either in the form in which we now have this early fragment, or in its puta-
tive original redaction), because later on both would require statements for the
alternations sustained by their initials that are impossible elegantly to incorpo-
rate into the patterns of śl. 8. But once the gen. has been described, then the

instr. is compendiously dealt with in terms of simple affixation of -s (*LDT*, note 6), hence śls. 9,10 (where the traditional numbering into two ślokas is without meaning), and śl. 11. The interpolation of śl. 12 into the treatment at this point also follows directly from considerations of morphophonemic descriptive economy, because of its initial alternation (on the other problems of śl. 12, §3.3.5 *infra*). Similar considerations of descriptive economy explain both the interpolation and ordering of śl. 13 and śl. 14; the treatment of case resumes with śl. 15,16 (again the traditional numbering for these two is without meaning), which deal with V., abl., now the sole remaining canonical Indic case to be treated. The *SCP* presentation of case thus concludes with śl. 17 on the voc., a passage that at the same time provides a transition to the next thematic subject of *SCP* II, where from śl. 18 on the text deals with larger syntactic relationships marked by such particles as *ni*, etc.

In order to survey the data concerned in the *SCP* presentation of case in terms of the principal concerns of the present paper, the schema immediately following, which displays relevant materials from *SCP* śl. 8 through śl. 18, will be useful, particularly because it shows the original terminology employed by the *SCP* in these matters as well as how that terminology has frequently been overlooked by the Western translators, or altered and skewed by the Tibetan commentators. In this schema the → restatements are to be understood as already described for the schema of the entire *SCP* displayed *supra*. In the (partial) citations of the *SCP* in the left column, small capitals direct particular attention to the case terminology of this portion of the treatise, which will be further discussed in §3.3. The original Indic case-system congruities of this portion of the *SCP* are indicated in the middle column, enclosed in curved brackets ({}). The right column displays two types of data: samples of the ways in which the *SCP*'s original statements on the Tibetan case-suffixes are recast in a sample from the more important Tibetan commentaries, with S = the commentary of the Mahāpaṇḍita of Situ, as found in the epitome by Dharmabhadra (ed. Inaba), Z = *Za ma tog* by Dharmapāla (1441-1526), ed. Laufer, *Sitzungsberichten der philos.-philolo. u. hist. Classe der kgl. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, 1898, 519-94, and R = Dbyaṅs-can grub-paḥi rdo-rje, ed. Schubert, *MSOS* Jhg. 31, 1928, plus translations cited from Bacot's version of the *SCP* ślokas isolated from their commentary, in his *Les ślokas grammaticaux* . . . , pp. 76-79. See table 3.2.

3.3 From this second schema we are at once able to see (a) that the *SCP* employs three different terminological constructs in its presentation of Tibetan case, and (b) that the later commentators, as well as the Western translators following them, have consistently obscured this originally differentiated system, the former by misleading (or at the very least, unauthorized, because undocumented) paraphrases, the latter most frequently by simply lumping to-

3.2 Schema of the *SCP* on case

8.1-3:→-*(s)u*

  4-5:→-*(r)u*

  6-7:→-*(d)u*

    8:→-*na, -la*

      9: las dañ ched dañ rten gnas dañ

      10: de ñid tshe skabs LA SGRA yin

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text{9.1-2:}\\\text{10.1-4.5}\tfrac{1}{2}\text{:}\end{array}\right\} \to \text{-}k(y)/g/i \quad \left\{ \text{VI gen.} \right\}$$

    .5½: . . . ḥbrel baḥi SA

$$\text{11.1:} + s\to\text{-}k(y)/g/is \quad \left\{ \text{III, instr.} \right\}$$

    .2: byed pa po ru šeses par bya

    12.1: —*i* + *ñ*→-*k(y)/g/añ*

      .2: tshig rgyan gñis dañ sdud par ḥgyur

    13.1-3: la sgra - *u* + *te*→-*ste*

      .4: de ni lhag dañ bcas paḥo

    14.1-2½: -*Ca* + *m*→-*Cam*

      .2¼: ḥbyed sdud yin

$$\text{15.1-3}\tfrac{1}{2}\text{: }na,\ la + s\to\text{-}nas,\ las \quad \left\{ \text{V, abl.} \right\}$$

      .3½: ḥbyuñ khuñs SA yin te

    16.1: dgar dañ sdud paḥan de bžin no

    17.: gañ miñ brjod paḥi dañ po ru kye sbyar ba ni bod pa yin   { voc. }

    18.1-2: -*n* + *i*→*ni*

      .3: dgar dañ bsnam paḥi TSHIG tu ḥgyur

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text{II acc.}\\\text{IV dat.}\\\text{VII loc.} \quad \text{place}\\\text{} \qquad\qquad \text{time}\end{array}\right\}$$

S: *id*. B: . . . Sont les particules de l'accusatif, du datif, du locatif, Du déterminatif et du locatif du temps.

S: . . .gyi sgra yin pas rnam dbye drug. . .

Z: . . . ḥbrel baḥi sgra

R: . . . rnam dbye drug pa ḥbrel sgra

B: . . . En leur ajoutant *i*, on exprime la relation.

S: . . . byed pa poḥi sgra bšad pa . . .
~ . . .sa. . .

R: . . . rnam dbye gsum pa byed sgra . . .

B: (En ajoutant le dixième suffix à ces particles,) On saura que l'on exprime l'agent.

S: . . .Ø. B: . . . On a les deux particules ornementales et l'augmentatif.

S: . . . lhag ma dañ bcas paḥi sgra.

B: . . . On obtient la particule continuative.

S: . . . sdud paḥi sgrar ḥjug pa yin no.

B: . . . On a la particule alternative.

S: . . . kyi sa yin. B: . . . On a les de provenance, Pour comparer et pour inclure.

S: . . . bod paḥi sgra. B: La particule *kye* est vocative.

S: . . . ni sgra. B: . . . Devient particule d'opposition et d'intensité.

gether all the terminological refinements of the original under the all-purpose rendering 'particle(s)'. Just as we now take seriously the terminological variations in Pāṇini (cf. §1.3.3 *supra*), so also must we be prepared to take seriously the analytic-descriptive categories of the *SCP* presentation of case, in the form in which these specific categories are exemplified in the lexical differentiation of its original terminology.

3.3.1 As in so many other aspects, śl. 8 again shows its older historical status *qua* text in its employment of the term *sgra = śabda* in order to designate the four Tibetan case relations, equivalent to three Indic cases, and the five Tibetan case-suffixes, that this śloka teaches. The Situ commentary does not tamper with this terminology, and (probably as a result) Bacot's translation is unexceptionable.

3.3.2 But the same can hardly be said of śl. 10 and śl. 15. These passages preserve another, and a different, and also almost surely an ancient, Tibetan grammatical term *sa*, which appears to have fallen out of use almost immediately after the period of composition of the *SCP*. As a consequence this term *sa* soon baffled the commentators, who universally resort to unauthorized and unsubstantiated paraphrase in order to explain it. The *Za ma tog*'s substitution of *sgra* for this difficult term in śl. 10 is early testimony to the difficulty of the problems that the scholastics encountered with this word; S and R pass on the same bold paraphrase in their turns. At śl. 15 the Situ commentary appears to keep the original form, without gloss or explanation, but it is significant that the *var. lects.* noted in the critical edition by Inaba of the Dharmabhadra epitome to this passage in effect reduce the reading to zero. We must also note in passing that S and R generally introduce the Indic case-numbers, e.g. *rnam dbye drug*, etc., even though these play no part in the *SCP* case presentation as such, and are also surely anachronistic, since they reflect the late commentators' secondary acquaintance with the Indic grammatical tradition; this system of case-numbers is also a representative example of an entirely extrinsic set of rule ordering externally imposed upon the text, and hence essentially irrelevant to its explication.

It is not particularly difficult to understand why the commentators have thus obviously had to struggle with this term *sa*, or why it so quickly dropped from their purview—this thanks in large measure to their efforts—within the Tibetan grammarians' tradition. Overriding all other difficulties was that of its meaning. Tib. *sa* generally translates Buddhist Skt. *bhumi* 'step, degree, stage' (Edgerton, *BHS Dict.*, pp. 410b-411a), or *sthāna* 'point, matter, subject' (ibid., p. 610a); but neither of these words appears to be attested as a grammatical term with reference to case forms or case relationships anywhere in the Indic tradition (while at the same time the phonetic sense of *sthāna* as 'position of articulation' is also surely irrelevant to the *SCP*'s employment of *sa*).

Among the translators, only Inaba has attempted to grapple with this *sa*, rendering it regularly with Japanese *arikata* 'the way (it, something) is, ought, or should be' (Inaba p. 335 to śl. 10, and p. 342 to śl. 15). As a translation, this rendering is by no means clear, nor does Inaba ever share with us his reasons for settling upon it; and *arikata* does not actually appear to have anything in common with the sense of *sa*. Nevertheless, his rendering does at least have the virtue of consistency, as well as signalling that the Tibetan original here employs a distinctive if difficult term. Perhaps Inaba's fairly obscure rendering of *sa* in these *SCP* passages is to be viewed in the light of his elsewhere (§ 11, p. 25 ff.) translating *gnas*, which he takes to be equivalent to *sthāna*, also with Japanese *arikata*, notably in the title of a still virtually unstudied grammatical treatise apparently dating from the second half of the eighth century, where the eight case relationships are called *gnas brgyad*. Bacot totally avoids the issue, and *sa* has no overt reading or equivalent in his version of either śl. 9-10 or śl. 15. Accordingly, it is small wonder that *sa* as a term finds no place in Bacot's *Index des termes grammaticaux*, where it should (but does not) appear at p. 91; nor is it to be found in Inaba's *Chibetto-go sakuin*, p. 9 (ff. p. 4 of his edition of Dharmabhadra's epitome), even though he regularly translates it as *arikata*; similarly it is missing from Schubert, *Anhang. Verzeichnis der tibetischen grammatischen Fachausdrücke (Gleichzeitig grammatisches Sachregister)*, pp. 52b-53a, *MSOS* Bd. XXXII.

But fortunately, we are able to make considerable headway in explaining this largely neglected and otherwise fairly obscure *sa* by means of reference to the Pāninian terminology, which proves directly to clarify śl. 15 and at the same time, if only by indirect implication, also to throw light on śl. 10. For its description of the syntactic-semantic relationship of the ablative case-suffixes, *SCP* śl. 15 uses the expression *hbyuṅ khuṅs sa* 'an original, or source-place (*khuṅs-sa*) out of which something emerges, is taken, or is withdrawn (*hbyuṅ-ba*)', cf. *hbyuṅ-khuṅ* = *chu-mig* 'a well, spring' and *hbyuṅ-khuṅs-kyi khams* 'a mineral', Jäschke, *Dict.*, p. 398a, with the last entry cited from Csoma! Given the context of the passage in which it is found, this *hbyuṅ khuṅs sa* may hardly be understood as other than a Tibetan calque upon the Pāninian description of the relationships of the ablative case forms of Sanskrit that employs *apādāna* 'taking away, removal, ablation', so that *apādāna* is the technical term "chez P de la rection casuelle (*kāraka*) représentée par un point fixe (*dhruva*) duquel on s'écarte (*apāya*)'' (Renou, *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit*, p.48, with more on *dhruva* at p.169). (Unfortunately the Sakaki index to the *Mhvyt.* appears to have a misprint at p. 12 for its entry *apādāna*).

This equivalence has in part already been noticed in general terms (e.g. Inaba, p. 15, where the term *hbyun-khuṅ* of *SCP* śl. 15 is aligned with *apādāna* from Pāṇ. 1, 4,24 and 2,3,28 together also with *Kātantra* 2,4,19);

what has not been accounted for until now (and what is missing from Inaba's table, *loc. cit.*) is the role of the *SCP*'s *sa* in rendering Pāṇinian *dhruva* 'the fixed point (from which the 'departure' of the ablative takes place)' (Monier-Williams, *Dict.*, p. 521c). Especially when we understand that *dhruva* is 'fixed, firm, constant, immovable (e.g. the earth)' (ibid., p. 521b), we are able to understand both how and why it has found itself rendered in the *SCP* by Tibetan *sa*. (On *dhruva* see also Chakravarti 1930.270-74: "the word . . . does not necessarily mean an absolutely motionless thing, but generally what remains more or less unaffected in the course of separation".) *Mhvyt.* 7285 has *dhruva = brtan-pa* 'firm, steadfast', but without any hint of the term's linguistic applications; nor do any of its translations for *sa* point in that direction. Nevertheless, in view of the extraordinary correspondence in all items of detail between *hbyuñ khuñs sa* on the one hand and the Pāṇinian description of the ablative relationship in terms of *apādāna* and *dhruva* on the other, there can remain little question of the correctness of the confrontation here proposed: *SCP hbyuñ khuñs = apādāna*, and *SCP sa = dhruva*. This proposal is additionally substantiated by a significant passage in the commentary of Blo-bzañ tshul-khrims (1845-1915), ed. Beijing 1957 (*SGTT*, p. 40); his paraphrase of *SCP* śl. 15 as *hbyuñ bahi gnas sam khuñs gtogs sa* (p. 79) indicates that he too recognized the Pāṇinian *apādāna* and *dhruva* in the Tibetan expression at issue.

In turn, it also appears fairly safe to speculate that it was from this originally quite literal rendering of Pāṇinian *dhruva* that, later in time but earlier in the received text of the *SCP*, the term *sa* found its way into the description of the genitive in śl. 10.[11] By means of this terminological employment, our received text of the *SCP* now in effect hints at one of the special features of rule order in Indic grammars as understood and explained by the post-Pāṇinians: when two rules conflict, that one takes precedence that is stated later in the grammar (Cardona 1970). Here the issue is less one of rule-conflict than of rule-intelligibility; and the principle may itself be rephrased to require that when two obscure statements follow in sequence, that one is to be used as the basis for exegesis that comes later in the grammar. For a full understanding of *SCP* śl. 9-10, it is necessary to let the language of the later śl. 15 take precedence over the otherwise obscure language of the earlier passages. This rule order feature serves to integrate śl. 9-10 closely with śl. 15, and this in turn additionally benefits the user of the grammar since it thus emphasizes the essentially interpolative character of śls. 12, 13, and 14, which interrupt the *SCP*'s presentation of case for the reasons already clarified *supra*.

In effect, then, we find only one overt term for case forms in the *SCP*, in the oldest textual stratum as reflected in śl. 8 which has *sgra = śabda*. Another surely ancient (but clearly subsequent) stratum, seen in śl. 9-10 and śl. 15, has *sa*, but this is not a term for specific case forms, but rather an equivalent for

dhruva, as employed in Pāṇinian descriptions of specific case relationships. The later Tibetan scholastic tradition conflated these two, losing sight of *sa* in the process, and also obscuring the original differentiation that obtains between these two in the *SCP* itself; the Western translators have incorporated this conflation, further obscuring the issue in the process. All this is particularly unfortunate because it has had the net effect of concealing one of the most characteristically Indic features of the linguistic analysis and description of the *SCP*, i.e. its fairly meticulous differentiation between specific semantic characterizations associated with individual case-form usages, and the so-called *kāraka* categories, a topic of wide implications for the understanding of both these two early Tibetan grammatical treatises, and one to which we are now in a position to turn our attention.[12]

3.3.3 No topic in their systems and theories is more involved, nor has any been more subtly elaborated by the Indic grammarians, than that of the *kāraka*s; none also has been the subject of as much misunderstanding and controversy—much of both continuing even today—on the part of modern, and especially Western, students of these texts. Under the circumstances, we can here hardly aim to do more than touch upon the broadest outlines of the topic, hoping (even if perhaps in vain) that in the process we will at least demonstrate the overall relevance of the *kāraka*s and their rules to a satisfactory reading of this particular portion of the *SCP*, and in particular for the recognition of the special role that *kāraka* formularizations play in this portion of our text.

The most useful general introduction to the topic and its bibliography is to be found in Cardona 1976 (III.1.5.5c.1, pp. 215-22), which contains, *inter alia*, the following key descriptions and definitions: "[in Pāṇini's grammar] some affixes are introduced on condition that kārakas are to be denoted . . . . The notion of kāraka is basic to Pāṇini's derivational system. A kāraka is a thing viewed in relation to an action, in the accomplishment of which it plays a given role" (215). Further, "there has been considerable discussion regarding the precise status of these kāraka categories. In 1893, Whitney . . . reacting to Liebich's dissertation (1886-87) in a typically acerbic manner, nevertheless made an important comment. Though Whitney could not fathom why Pāṇini proceeded as he did, still he noted appositely that the *kāraka* categories 'are not an independent product of his [Pāṇini's] logical faculty, but simply a reflection of case forms' . . . " (216-7). This last is a reference to Whitney 1893.166 (in the reprint in *RSG*, pp. 166-84), and in particular to the following opinionated passage: "Pāṇini does not take up the cases as forms of nouns, setting forth the various uses of each, after our manner; he adopts the vastly more difficult and dangerous method of establishing a theoretical list of modes of verb-modification by case, or of ideal case-relations (he calls them *kāraka*, 'factor' or 'adjunct'), to which he then distributes the cases . . . Any-

thing more crude or unphilosophical than this could not well be imagined.''
Cardona argues convincingly that those who would advance the view that
"the position held by some modern theorists, that grammatical relations are
universal, is Pāṇini's position too", are actually misrepresenting the notion of
the *kārakas*: instead, "Pāṇini set up his kāraka categories in order to set up
conditions under which affixes—both post-verbal and post-nominal—would
be introduced, so that, far from having nothing to do with syntax or the deri-
vation of correct Sanskrit utterances derived by Pāṇinian rules, the kāraka
rules are intimately related to Pāṇini's syntactic rules" (Cardona 1976.218).
Even in 1893, the same year as Whitney's remarks, and in a reply to the same,
Böhtlingk had put the same point quite neatly: "*Kāraka* ist nicht jede «case-
relation», sondern nur die Beziehung eines Nomens zu einem Verbum . . . "
(1893.186 in the reprint in *RSG*, pp. 185-92), adding as a dramatic aside,
"Mit dieser *kāraka*-Theorie, die schwierig und gefährlich genannt wird, ist
Wh. nicht einverstanden. Die Schwierigkeit und Gefährlichkeit derselben hat
aber den kühnen, originellen und genialen P. nicht abgeschreckt" (loc.cit.).
In a word, "Pāṇini's *kāraka* . . . categorization serves as an intermediary be-
tween semantics and grammatical expressions derived by rules of the gram-
mar" (Cardona 1976.220).

All this holds quite as valid for Tibetan, as we find the language treated in
the first grammatical treatise, as it does for Sanskrit as reflected within the
system of Pāṇini. Just as in Pāṇini, so also in the SCP (and as we hope to
show later elsewhere, in the RKHP as well), we have to reckon with the fact
that the theme of one of the "several main parts" of the grammar is "the syn-
tactic rules which serve to derive verbal and nominal forms through affixation
conditioned in part by the expression of defined syntactico-semantic catego-
ries" (Cardona 1969.3). But in order usefully to explore the full implications
of these syntactico-semantic categories for a reading of the *SCP*, we must first
concern ourselves with the way in which the later scholastic tradition that has
grown up about this text has all too frequently obscured an important third ter-
minological category that the *SCP* employs, along with *sgra* and *sa*, in its pre-
sentation of case. This third category is the zero ('Ø') that the text utilizes in
lieu of either *sgra* or *sa*, hence the Ø of śls. 11, 12, 13, and 14.

Like the overall concept of the mathematical zero itself, the employment of
zero elements in linguistic analysis and description is of course to be recog-
nized as a hallmark of the Indic intellectual tradition; that the employment of
the zero in the *SCP* presentation of case is involved and subtle is, accordingly,
less surprising than the way in which the original employment of this well-
known descriptive device in the text has generally been overlooked by the
later tradition. Indeed, in their treatments of the ślokas cited, the commenta-
tors have generally been even more misleading than in the cases where they
have, e.g., paraphrased *sa* by *sgra*, etc., since in supplying overt terms (e.g.,

the Situ commentary, using both *sgra* and *sa* for śl. 11, R using *sgra* for id.,
etc.) they are not merely paraphrasing something found in the original, they
are instead actually mutilating the text as they (and we) have it, since in effect
they replace nothing (Ø) with something (*sa* or *sgra*).

Bacot's translation is admirable at śl. 11, where his impersonal "On saura
que l'on exprime l'agent" deftly renders, at least by implication, the Ø of the
original. But unfortunately Bacot immediately thereafter totally abandoned
this careful (and correct) approach to his text, and from śl. 12 through śl. 14
he regularly renders all the Øs of the *SCP* by interpolating "la particule, les
particules", even though nothing overt corresponding to these renderings is to
be found in the text. Inaba is rather more meticulous on this point. His Japa-
nese translation of śl. 11 (Inaba p.336) is less literal than Bacot's, but it has
the virtue (along with his śl. 13 (p.339) and his śl. 14 (p.341)) of avoiding the
unauthorized interpolation of words meaning 'particle' or of any other overt,
and here extraneous, grammatical terms. Inaba's translations of the ślokas are
sometimes heavy with questionable bracketed additions, but at least they
avoid overt mutilation of the original on the present score. Even at śl. 12,
where Inaba unfortunately falls victim to reproducing Bacot's reading more or
less intact, he manages to avoid the "les [deux] particules" of the French ver-
sion that he is placing under contribution (Inaba, p. 337).

What is actually at issue in the four Øs of *SCP* śls. 11-14, and as a conse-
quence what has also until now been obscured by the Tibetan tradition and the
Western and Japanese translators alike, is that single refinement of grammati-
cal analysis and description that is of cardinal importance for a reading, much
less for a translation, of the *SCP*. This same refinement being a commonplace
of all the Indic grammars, it is hardly unexpected to find it in the first Tibetan
grammatical treatise; in a word, we have here to reckon with the general cate-
gories of the *kārakas* and the *kāraka* rules. In essence, it is for the *kārakas*, as
opposed to and contrasted with the nominal case-suffix forms proper, that the
SCP here employs its Øs.

3.3.4 In the examples that they cull in order to gloss śl. 11, the later com-
mentaries make it clear that they have always understood the fashion in which
the *kāraka* relationship of *karaṇa* 'instrumental' taught in this passage applies
equally to the two well-known WT constructions with -*k(g)/y/is* that are quite
obviously different both semantically and syntactically, i.e. those in which a
noun with this case suffix appears as agent (in the sense of 'instrument') of an
intransitive verb, and those in which a noun with the same case suffix appears
as the (so-called 'logical') subject of a transitive verb, where however it is still
always in a sense also instrumental (thus, Dharmapala, in Inaba, text p. 20,
translation p. 336).[13] The intricate intersections that obtain between the origi-
nally Indic, Pāṇinian-based teachings of the instrumental *kāraka* relationships
on the one hand and those evolved by the Tibetan grammarians on the other,

in order to make it possible for them to accommodate the WT constructions with -*k(g)/y/is*, are too extensive to be treated here: they are exemplified in the similarities, but also in the differences, between e.g. *parasur vṛkṣam chinatti* (Cardona 1976.219) on the one hand and *gris gcod-pa* (Jäschke, *Dict.*, p. 76ᵇ) on the other; and *inter alia* they will eventually provide materials for the future investigation of yet another enormous area of linguistic analysis and description where the Tibetan masters brought to bear upon their borrowed Indic intellectual heritage the full force of their frequently surprising powers of invention and innovation. To paraphrase Böhtlingk, for all its difficulties and dangers, the *kāraka* theory terrified the intrepid, original and brilliant author(s) of the *SCP* no more than it had Pāṇini and his school: both were willing to undertake the risks to which Whitney alluded in order to explore the complexities of this system, because of the compendious fashion in which this same scheme ultimately facilitated and refined their linguistic analysis and description. Under the circumstances, surely we today can at least dare to be equally brave.

3.3.5 The rationale for the textual, resp. structural interpolation of śl. 12, which teaches the forms and meanings of *kyañ*, *ḥañ*, *yañ*, so that it immediately follows śl. 11, is easily understood in terms of descriptive economy: by this particular ordering of the rules of its grammar, the *SCP* is able to discharge its duties with respect to the forms in question without the necessity for otherwise and in some other place recapitulating the morphophonemic statements required to account for their initial alternation. This then explains why the account of *kyañ* etc. intrudes into the text's presentation of the case suffixes and of their grammar at this particular point in the treatise; but exactly what it is that the *SCP* has to say about the syntactic meaning of these particular forms, once they have been taught, is somewhat less easy to comprehend.

The difficulties of this śloka have given rise to a considerable amount of largely irresponsible exegesis in the Tibetan schools, most of it no more than sheer speculation; see the careful and useful accounts of the views of the various commentators in Inaba, pp. 215-9, §148.2. What is most significant in all this is that, e.g., the Mahāpaṇḍita of Situ and his epitomist (in Inaba, p. 21), uncharacteristically do not interpolate any extraneous grammatical terms into their paraphrases of the *SCP* at this point, for once remaining faithful—if only after their fashion—to the Ø of the original's *tshig rgyan gñis daṅ sdud par ḥgyur*.

Unfortunately, the translators, Inaba included, have not been equally fastidious. Inaba here writes *joji* ('particle, suffix', p. 337), uncritically following Bacot, who had earlier rendered this with "On a les deux particules ornementales et l'augmentatif" (p.77). With the usual advantages of hindsight, we now can see that much damage has been done by an otherwise innocent note by Bacot, who wrote, "*tshig rgyan ornement du discours*, est à peu

près synonyme de *tshig phrad* morphème" (p. 27, note 1). This is yet another example of the unwarranted assumption of specious synonymity which so frequently, as here, plays havoc with the precise terminological distinctions of the original text; and indeed, Inaba (p. 216) cites this same passage by Bacot as his source and sole authority.

Together with this problem of specious synonymity, the reading and interpretation of this śloka also confront us with two other questions earlier alluded to (§1.3.2), both involved with the reasons why the highly elaborated views of the later Tibetan scholastic authorities are difficult to entertain intact, for all their evidence of wide reading and retentive memories, for the simple reason that their opinions fly in the face not only of the grammar but also of the attested lexical meanings of the forms as they appear in the text concerned. Indeed, the problems of śl. 12 are so numerous as to merit compendious treatment elsewhere; for the time being we can here do no more than point out the gist of the problem.

In its syntax, the general reading of the schools, reflected also in the available translations, is unlikely in the extreme, particularly in its treatment of both *gñis* and *dañ*. Just as there is no word in the original that would correspond to, or account for, the translators' 'particules'. resp. *joji*, so also the *gñis* in this śloka can hardly, from its location within the syntactic structure of the original, have been intended (as all the commentators would have it) to qualify *tshig-rgyan* (with the '-' *sic*) 'and' *sdud-par*.

On the lexical level, we here confront one of the most difficult of the Tibetan grammatical terms, *tshig*. Bacot's note (cited above), with *tshig rgyan* as 'ornement du discours', surely pointed in the correct direction; but unfortunately, after this good beginning, he then immediately departed from that approach and unwarrentedly assumed synonymity with *tshig-phrad*. On *tshig*, an important beginning has now been made in Simonsson 1982a.537, where he discusses 'whether it corresponds to the *pada* of the Buddhist philosophical speculation or to the verb-centered *vākya* . . . of the Pāṇinian tradition." Here Simonsson is returning to an earlier concern, first expressed in his *ITS*, p. 242 (cited *SGTT*, p. 14, note 87), relating to the overall problem of the precise meaning of *tshig*, along with a number of other basic but still most imperfectly understood Tibetan grammatical terms.

At any rate, and despite the Herculean efforts of the schools, the text of śl. 12 remains a laconic enigma. But as we pointed out two decades ago (now in *SGTT*, pp. 15-16), it is an enigma that is rendered at least somewhat less enigmatic when we compare the received text of this śloka in the *SCP* with §20 of the *Sgra-sbyor bam-po gñis-pa*, *ITS* p. 255. This comparison (full details of which are available in the works cited) does not solve all the problems of this text; but at least it makes it clear that the *SCP* passage is best, indeed, solely, to be understood as a highly condensed paraphrase of the content of the *Sgra-*

sbyor bam-po gñis-pa passage, "or of some other third and presently un-
known text affiliated with the *SSBP* passage or closely resembling it, and that
as might have been expected, what the text gained in elegance and concise-
ness in the course of being restated it lost in clarity" (*SGTT*, p. 16). The com-
parison also demonstrates the sense in which the *tshig rgyan gñis* (*sic*! and not
tshig-rgyan, gñis . . . , as the commentators would have it) is to be taken: the
'two' elements or entities being described are, in Simonsson's terms, *tshig* (*gi
phrad*) 'the particles of discourse', and *rgyan* (*lta bu*) 'the so-called ornamen-
tals', i.e. the syntactic or lexical situations in which it is necessary to under-
stand (or, for the *SSBP*, to translate) a combination of two or more
morphemes literally but also with full attention to the semantic role of each of
the constituent elements, as against those other situations where this is unnec-
essary: "man begnügt sich damit, den Sinn des Kernwortes wiederzugeben"
(*ITS*, p. 256). In other words, as we might well have guessed, the *SCP* after
all *is* a text; and as such, it has its own history, *qua* text.

4. "The interpretation of Pāṇini is possible only with the help of commen-
taries, which does not mean that one should not make special efforts, as diffi-
cult as that may be, to get away at times from those commentaries" (Renou
1969.486, §9). Similarly, the interpretation of the *SCP* is possible only with
the help of the later commentaries; but nevertheless—and as we have hoped
to demonstrate in the present contribution—this hardly entitles us to overlook
the language, grammar, and structure of our text if or when doing so becomes
the price of following the later commentators.

Not the least of the many exciting future prospects for these studies now
opened up for us by Simonsson are his suggestion that "the Tibetan theory of
grammar is founded on two sources, the Pāṇinian vyākaraṇa and the specula-
tions on language as they are to be found in the buddhistic texts on dogmatics
(e.g. Abhidharmakośa by Vasubandhu)", as well as his hint that "[t]his
duality proves to be the reason for certain difficulties in the Tibetan arsenal of
grammatical concepts" (1982b.287). The entire question of the precise nature
and exact dimensions of the innovations that were surely wrought upon the
massive structure of Indic grammatical science and linguistic speculation in
the course of its transmission within the Buddhist schools is one that today is
anything but well understood. Renou claimed to be able to detect but few gen-
uine 'innovations' in the grammar of Candragomin (1936, §3); nevertheless,
even this long-standing, well-known study hardly rules Simmonsson's far-
reaching speculations on this topic out of question, it simply shows us once
more how much still remains to be done along the lines of assessing the ulti-
mate impact of Buddhist thought upon Indic grammatical science: this also (to
borrow Renou's own words) "does not mean that one should not make special
efforts, as difficult as that may be . . . "

In the course of such an assessment, an account (still largely to be written) of the linguistic description and grammatical techniques of the *SCP* and *RKHP* must necessarily play a major role; and before the more narrowly Buddhist aspects of this question can adequately be grasped, we must first of all place our control of the larger Indic facets of these texts on a more stable philological ground than that upon which it has until now reposed: hence our present concern with text structure and rule ordering in the *SCP*, the two being without question the most essentially Indic aspects of this or any other grammatical treatise.

We have already had occasion to cite Whitney 1893 *supra*, but there within a context that might well leave the impression that the master Indologist of New Haven had nothing of value on these questions to teach us today: that would be both unfair and misleading. Even given all his difficulty in grasping the essential spirit of Indic grammatical science, Whitney was nevertheless able to write in conclusion, "I am fully persuaded that anyone who should master the Hindu grammatical science without losing his head, who should become thoroughly familiar with Pāṇini and escape being Pāṇini-bitten, would be able to make exposures of the weaknesses and shortcomings and needless obscurities of the grammar on a scale hitherto unknown" (Whitney 1893, cited *RSG*, p.184). *Mutatis mutandis*, this may even serve as an epitome of our present goal, and of the aim of this paper: we are fully persuaded that anyone who should master the Tibetan grammarians and their science without losing his head, who should become thoroughly familiar with these texts and escape being bitten by the later commentators, will be able to make exposures of the strengths and merits and many still only partially comprehended subleties of their grammars, on a scale hitherto unknown.

NOTES

1. Alexander Csoma de Kőrös, Enumeration of historical and grammatical works to be met with in Tibet, *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 7 (1838), Part II, pp. 147-152.

2. Other abbreviations for frequently cited works:

GTR = R. A. Miller. 1983. Thon mi Sambhoṭa and his grammatical treatises reconsidered, in *TLHC* Heft 10, pp. 183-205.

Inaba = Inaba Shōju. 1954. *Chibetto-go koten bunpō-gaku*. Kyoto.

ITS = Nils Simonsson. 1957. *Indo-tibetische Studien. Die Methoden der tibetischen Übersetzungen für die Sanskritphilologie*, I. Uppsala.

LDT = R. A. Miller. 1984. Linguistic devices and techniques in the first Tibetan grammatical treatise. In L. Ligeti, ed., *Tibetan and Buddhist studies commemorating the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös*. Bibliotheca Or. Hung., Vol. XXIV / 2, pp. 175-195. Budapest.

RSG = J. F. Staal, ed. 1972. *A reader on the Sanskrit grammarians*. Cambridge.

SGTT = R. A. Miller. 1976. *Studies in the grammatical tradition in Tibet*.Amsterdam.

TLHC=E. Steinkellner and H. Tauscher, eds. 1983. *Contributions on Tibetan language, history and culture, Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrős Symposium held at Velm-Vienna, Austria, 13-19 September 1981. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde*, Heft 10, Heft 11. Wien.

3. But for the traditional approach to these question, see most recently also Narkyid 1983.

4. *GTR*, passim., and also our remarks in *Journal of the Tibet Society* 1, 45-62, 1982.

5. This point is further explored in *LDT*, passim.

6. Simonsson consistently writes, not of 'ślokas', but of 'sūtras', in connection with the *SCP* and *RKHP*, and his point is well taken; the tradition of referring to the statements in these two texts as ślokas urgently calls for reassessment.

7. We employ the conventional numbering for the statements of the *SCP* throughout, even though these clearly have no relation to the content and structure of the text itself, because they facilitate reference to various texts and editions already employing them.

8. The text translated by J. Schubert, *Tibetische Nationalgrammatik* (Leipzig, 1937), is a late epitome of the original; of much greater value are the quite early commentaries of Dharmapālabhadra (1441-1526), Tōhoku-zōgai 7071, 7072, which have been translated by Inaba in the *Ōtani Gakuhō* 54:1, 1974, 37-51, and 58:4, 1979, 13-31 (unfortunately however without the original Tibetan being included).

9. Translated by J. Schubert, *MSOS*, Jg. 31, 1928, and Jg. 32, 1929.

10. The text and translation that form such an important part of the original edition of Inaba were unfortunately not included in the second reprinting of his *Bunpō-gaku*, Kyoto, 1966.

11. My thinking on this issue was considerably clarified by a conversation with Dr. Kurt Keutzer during the Bloomington Symposium.

12. *SGTT*, p. 121 sqq., is to be corrected.

13. But Inaba, p. 15, §5, and p. 195, §141.2, when he takes *byed pa po* as '*kartṛ-karaṇa*' (punctuation sic!) is not to be followed literally.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Broido, M. 1983. Bshad thabs: Some Tibetan methods of explaining the tantras. In *TLHC*, Heft 11, pp. 15-45.

Böhtlingk, Otto. 1893. Whitney's letzte Angriff auf Pāṇini. Reprinted in *RSG*, pp. 186-192.

Cardona, George. 1969. Studies in Indian grammarians, 1: The method of description reflected in the śivasūtras. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 59, part 1, pp. 3-48.

————— . 1970. Some principles of Pāṇini's grammar. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 1, 40-74.

————— . 1974. Pāṇini's kārakas: agency, animation and identity. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 2, 231-306.

————— . 1976. *Pāṇini, A survey of research*. The Hague-Paris.

Chakravarti, P. C. 1930. *The philosophy of Sanskrit grammar*. Calcutta.

Deshpande, M. M. 1984. Review of Kiparsky 1979. *Language* 60, 161-164.

Fowler, M. 1965. How ordered are Pāṇini's rules?. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 85, 44-47.

Kiparsky, P. 1979. *Pāṇini as a variationist*. Cambridge, Poona.

Narkyid, N. 1983. The origin of the Tibetan script. In *TLHC*, Heft 10, pp. 207-221.

Renou, Louis. 1936. *Études de grammaire sanskrite, Première série, 3, Les «innovations» de la grammaire de Candragomin*, pp. 88-143. Paris.

————. 1969. Pāṇini. In T. A. Sebeok, ed., *Current trends in Linguistics, 5, Linguistics in South Asia*. The Hague-Paris.

Sag, Ivan A. 1974. The Grassmann's Law Ordering Pseudoparadox. *Linguistic Inquiry* 5, 591-607.

Simonsson, Nils. 1982a. Reflections on the grammatical tradition in Tibet. In L. A. Hercus et al., eds., *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, pp. 531-544. Canberra.

————. 1982b. On the concept of sentence in ancient Indian and Tibetan theory and on the function of case particles in Tibetan according to Tibetan grammarians. *Fenno-Ugrica Suecana* 5, 281-191.

Steinkellner, Ernst. 1978. Remarks on tantristic hermeneutics. In L. Ligeti, ed., *Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium held at Mátrafüred, Hungary 24-30 September 1976*. Budapest.

Whitney, W. D. 1893. On recent studies in Hindu grammar. Reprinted in *RSG*, pp.165-185.

Yamaguchi Zuihō. 1976. *Sanjūshō, Seinyūhō* no seiritsu jiki wo megutte - Thon-mi Sambhoṭa no seizon nendai. *Tōyō Gakuhō* 57.1-2, 1-34.