Univerzita Karlova

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav asijských studií

Bakalářská práce

Bc. Denis Barát

sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa, An Early Sanskrit-Tibetan Glossary of Buddhist Terms

sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa, raný sanskrtsko-tibetský glosář buddhistických termínů

Acknowledgments

I am thankful to my supervisor, dr. Daniel Berounský for his guidance in choosing and exploring the topic of this thesis.

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Bratislavě dne 30.5.2022

Denis Barát

Keywords

sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa, Buddhism, Tibet, Buddhist terminology

Klíčová slova

sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa, buddhismus, Tibet, buddhistická terminologie

Abstract

This thesis is concerned with the royal translation project during the early period of the transmission of Buddhism to Tibet. This period is remarkable for both the amount of translated literature and for the high level of standardization. One of the tools for the centralization of translation, the normative treatise *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, is the main topic of this thesis. This treatise provides fixed Tibetan equivalents of more than four hundred Sanskrit terms based on their grammatical and hermeneutical explanations. The first fourteen terms will be translated here to shed light on the approaches the Tibetan translators employed in fixing Tibetan terminology. It will be shown that the creators of the normative terminology firmly and creatively based themselves on the earlier Indian Buddhist hermeneutical and grammatical tradition with the intention of producing meaningful Tibetan translations that are firmly grounded in doctrinal considerations.

Abstrakt

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá císařským překladatelským projektem v raném období transmise buddhismu do Tibetu. Toto období je pozoruhodné jak množstvím přeložené literatury, tak vysokou úrovní standardizace. Jeden z nástrojů centralizace překladu, normativní dílo *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, je hlavním tématem této práce. Toto dílo uvádí předepsané tibetské ekvivalenty více než čtyř set sanskrtských termínů na základě jejich gramatických a hermeneutických vysvětlení. Bude zde přeloženo prvních čtrnáct termínů, aby byly osvětleny přístupy, které tibetští překladatelé použili při vytváření tibetské terminologie. Bude ukázáno, že tvůrci normativní terminologie pevně a kreativně vycházeli z dřívější indické buddhistické hermeneutické a gramatické tradice se záměrem vytvořit smysluplné tibetské překlady, které by byly pevně zakotveny v doktrinálních vysvětleních.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The transmission of Buddhism into Tibet can generally be divided into two periods: the early dispensation (*snga dar*) and the later dispensation (*phyi dar*). Tibetan Buddhism, as it is known today, with its great emphasis on tantric practices, is primarily a product of the later period, which began in the late tenth century (Kollmar-Paulenz 2007, 305). However, the earlier dispensation created a crucial basis for the later transmitters by establishing a monastic community in Tibet and, more importantly, producing an incredible amount of translated literature.

This thesis is concerned precisely with this translation effort of the earlier period, which is remarkable not only for the number of texts it covered but also in the high level of standardization. The translation project was royally sponsored, which means that guidelines for translators and normative lexicographical texts were issued as royal decrees which had to be followed. One of these normative dictionaries is called *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, which consists of Tibetan glosses on more than four hundred Sanskrit terms and justifications for the fixed Tibetan translations. In this thesis, fourteen of these terms, making up the first thematic area, will be translated and commented on to shed light on how the early Tibetan translators approached exegesis of specific terminology and how they based their translations on the provided explanations.

As for the structure of this thesis, the following chapter provides a brief overview of the *snga dar* period, which will enable us to situate the royal translation project into its historical context. The royal translation project is presented in the next chapter, including the edicts that guided the process. The chapter also includes a discussion of the catalogues of translations and the normative lexicographical works. The greatest focus is put on the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* and the guidelines for translators therein. The following chapter is devoted to the principles which the compilers of the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* followed when creating glosses and translations of Sanskrit terms. Finally, the last chapter contains a translation of the first thematic area of the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa,* together with brief commentaries on each of the entries.

2. The transmission of Buddhism to Tibet

This chapter comprises an overview of the transmission of Buddhism into Tibet in the imperial or early period (*snga dar*). What is peculiar about this era is that its beginnings are shrouded in layers of mythical accounts which stem from significantly later sources. They display a clear religious motive of creating a specific foundation myth and justification for Tibet being a Buddhist land. However, it would be difficult to limit the discussion only to historical facts when dealing with this topic. This is because, in all extant literature, we are dealing with semi-legendary narratives. Already the texts from the post-imperial period, our earliest narrative sources, engage in a mythologizing discourse (Doney 2021, 5). The focus of this discourse shifted throughout the course of history. At first, the greatest emphasis was placed on the role of the emperors (*btsan po*), who are presented as the perfect religious rulers (*dharmarāja*). Three emperors, in particular, are given a special position: Srong btsan sGam po (reigned ?–649, also known as Khri Srong btsan), Khri Srong lde btsan (reigned 756–800), and Khri gTsug lde btsan (reigned 815–?,[1] also known as Ral pa can). In some sources, these three are even identified as emanations of the bodhisattvas Avalokiteśvara, Mañjuśrī, and Vajrapāṇi, respectively (Uray 1989, 9). Later, Indian masters, most significantly Padmasambhava, were put into the foreground (Doney 2017, 316).

As has been mentioned, it is unclear when Buddhism first entered Tibet. According to a legendary account, the Buddha's teachings first entered Tibet during the reign of the semi-legendary emperor Lha tho tho ri gnyan btsan (possibly 5th century CE) when a casket containing, among other things, a copy of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha sūtra* fell from the sky (Halkias 2017, 138). Because at this time, no one in Tibet was able to understand these scriptures, the emperor only made offerings to them and venerated them. There is also an alternative legend, which claims that at the time of Lha tho tho ri gnyan btsan, two foreign monks reached Tibet with some scriptures, but because the Tibetans were illiterate, no one was able to understand them (Jamgön Kongtrul 2010, 238).

According to the Tibetan historiographical tradition, the first ruler to act as a patron of Buddhism was Srong btsan sGam po. He is credited with having the Tibetan script created,

---

[1] The exact dates of Khri gTsug lde btsan's reign are unclear. Scherrer-Schaub (2002, 281) cites 836 as the end date, while Kapstein (2000, 35) cites 838 as the year of his death.

establishing laws based on Buddhist virtues, and founding temples. In addition, Srong btsan sGam po was later identified with the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara. This legend is expanded mainly in the early *phyi dar* period through revealed texts (*gter ma*) such as the *Maṇi bka' 'bum*, but its beginnings can already be found in the early post-imperial period (Uray 1989, 9). However, the available evidence suggests that Buddhism played only a minor role during his reign (Kollmar-Paulenz 2007, 312). Moreover, the extant fragments of Srong btsan sGam po's laws show little evidence of Buddhist influence (Dotson 2013, 88). Nevertheless, Chinese sources corroborate evidence for writing being put into use during his reign (Uray 1955, 106).

If Buddhism truly was introduced to Tibet during the reign of Srong btsan sGam po, it must not have taken a deep root in the court, as it did not play any role in the reign of Srong btsan sGam po's successors. The next significant event happened during the reign of Khri lDe gtsug btsan (reigned 712–754, also known as Mes ag tshom), whose Chinese wife Jincheng was an avid supporter of Buddhism (Schaeffer, Kapstein, and Tuttle 2013, 13). She founded several monasteries in Central Tibet and invited monks from Central Asia, including refugee monks from Khotan and China (Beckwith 1983, 7). Unfortunately, coinciding with the arrival of the foreign monks, an epidemic spread in Lhasa, for which they were blamed (Dotson 2017, 2). This supposedly sparked a wave of anti-Buddhist sentiments, which also resulted in the emperor's assassination.

After Khri lDe gtsug btsan's assassination, his fourteen-year-old son took the throne (Dotson 2017, 3). He became known as Khri Srong lde btsan, and his reign can be considered a dividing line in the history of Tibetan Buddhism. In a copy of an edict connected with the founding of Tibet's first monastery, it is said that Buddhism was banned in Tibet in the aftermath of Khri lDe gtsug btsan's death. However, on the basis of bad omens, Khri Srong lde btsan decided to reverse this ban and officially adopt Buddhism (Dotson 2017, 4). It is possible that the adoption of Buddhism was, in large part, a political act. The empire reached its greatest extent under Khri Srong lde btsan, and Buddhism not only created an opportunity to legitimize Tibet as an international and civilized region but also provided possible places of power and administrative support which answered directly to the emperor, independent of the local clan politics (Walter 2009, 26). The intention to keep Buddhism closely connected to the imperial administration can be seen in the fact that its organization was bureaucratized from the very beginning; Khri Srong lde btsan established a council whose purpose was to regulate the available teachings (Doney 2017, 313), officially

sponsored monasteries and temples and traveled with a court *saṃgha* (Dotson 2007, 2). Indian Buddhism had not yet been established in Tibet, and so there had been no existing institutions that would have to be subsumed under the emperor's power. This fact could be an important reason for its eventual triumph over Chinese Buddhism, which had a presence in Tibet at least since princess Jincheng.

An important person in the transmission of Buddhism to Tibet during Khri Srong lde btsan's life was the Indian master Śāntarakṣita, who arrived in 763 (Wangchuk 2020, 967) and was instrumental in establishing the lineage of monastic ordination in Tibet. It is also possible that the royal translation project began not long after his arrival (see below). According to one of the earliest religious historiographical documents, the *sBa bzhed*, and *dBa' bzhed*, its earlier version, fragments of which were found at Dunhuang, Śāntarakṣita was invited by the minister sBa gsal snang, who was also among the first to receive monastic ordination (Kapstein 2000, 41). According to the same source, Khri Srong lde btsan, Śāntarakṣita, and sBa gsal snang were the three main actors in the transmission of Buddhism into Tibet (Doney 2017, 317). In later sources, sBa gsal snang was replaced in the triad by the Indian tantric master Padmasambhava, who even eclipsed the emperor as the most important person of the period (ibid., 318).

In 779, Khri Srong lde btsan founded the first Tibetan monastery, bSam yas. On this occasion, an edict was promulgated, in which the emperor reasserted his support of Buddhism and bound his successors to protect and sponsor the teachings (Schaeffer, Kapstein, and Tuttle 2013, 61). According to later accounts, in 792, the emperor convened a debate at bSam yas, which was to decide between proponents of the Chinese sudden approach to liberation and the Indian gradualist approach, who was to have continued support in Tibet (Biondo 2021, 75). Most Tibetan sources claim that the Indian side, led by Kamalaśīla, won the debate, and Chinese teachers were expelled from Tibet. However, Chinese sources claim that the Chinese side, led by the monk Moheyan, was victorious (Kollmar-Paulenz 2007, 325). It is unclear whether the debate even happened in the manner that the Tibetan sources claim or whether it was a device meant to legitimize Tibetan reliance on Indian Buddhism and its gradualist approach. Nevertheless, traces of the Chinese Chan tradition have persisted in Tibet (Kapstein 2000, 75).

It seems that Khri Srong lde btsan's successor, Khri lDe srong btsan (reigned 800–815, also known as Sad na legs),[2] received education from Buddhist monks (Schaeffer, Kapstein, and Tuttle 2013, 58). It then comes as no surprise that he carried on his father's legacy and became an important supporter of Buddhism. It is likely that during his reign, the institutionalization and standardization of the translation of Buddhist scriptures reached their highest level. He also initiated a reform of the Tibetan spelling and terminology, which was connected with the revision of all previous translations (see below). However, Khri lDe srong btsan was not given as much credit by later Tibetan historians as the other Buddhist emperors, which perhaps stems from the fact that he was conflated with his son and successor, Khri gTsug lde btsan, who received the credit for the revision and standardization of the translation process (Uray 1989, 8).

The influence of Buddhism was even more significant under Khri gTsug lde btsan, who strengthened the position of the *saṃgha* by appointing more monks as ministers and supposedly allotted great material support to monasteries. This caused unrest among the nobility and eventually resulted in Khri gTsug lde btsan's assassination (Kollmar-Paulenz 2007, 333).

According to Tibetan historiographers, the next emperor, Khri 'U'i dum brtan (reigned 841–842, also known as Glang dar ma), was unfavorable to Buddhism. He is presented as an evil ruler who took away the support for monasteries and made monks return to lay life, which led to his assassination by the abbot of bSam yas (ibid., 335). However, it is possible that the reality was different. There is evidence that Khri 'U'i dum brtan continued supporting Buddhism, and one of the imperial translation catalogues even contains a text said to be composed by him (Halkias 2004, 58). There is a possibility that the vilification of Khri 'U'i dum brtan stems from the fact that during his reign, Tibet experienced an economic crisis brought about by climate change, which made the empire unable to continue its extensive support of Buddhist institutions (Yamaguchi 1996, 238).[3] Be that as it may, the end of Khri 'U'i dum brtan's reign coincides with the fall of the Tibetan empire and can be regarded as the end of the *snga dar* period.

---

[2]   The succession after Khri Srong lde btsan is unclear, with various sources presenting diverging histories. After comparing multiple sources, Brandon Dotson (2007, 15) came up with this tentative chronology: in 797 Khri Srong lde btsan abdicated in favor of his son Mu ne btsan. However, Mu ne btsan died a year later, making Khri Srong lde btsan return to the throne and rule for two more years, from 798 to 800, together with his youngest son Khri lDe srong btsan. After Khri Srong lde btsan's death in 800, his elder son Mu rug btsan seized the throne and ruled for two years. Khri lDe srong btsan successfully deposed him in 802 and ruled as the sovereign monarch until his death in 815.
[3]   Referenced by Walter (2009, 52).

3. The royal translation project

As we have seen in the previous chapter, even though Buddhism was present in Tibet at least since the seventh century, the court's position towards it was at times ambivalent. Possibly, at the time of Khri lDe gtsug btsan alias Me ag tshom, Buddhism was still seen as a tradition of foreigners. This changed in the second half of the eighth century when Khri Srong lde btsan declared Buddhism the state religion and sponsored the building of the bSam yas monastery. The newly instituted royal sponsorship brought with it many resources, which occasioned a unique project in the history of Buddhism, strictly regulated translation of a staggering number of texts. This chapter is dedicated to this translation effort. It begins with a general introduction to its history and the catalogues of translated texts. Then, the way the translation process was regulated and the normative treatises are covered.

The first translations into Tibetan were likely done even before the official royal project began. Tradition holds that the first translations were already produced during the reign of Srong btsan sGam po, namely the *Ratnamegha* and *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra*s (see, for instance, Bu ston 1990, 8–9). The veracity of this claim cannot be confirmed with certainty, especially when we take into account the fact that Tibetan historiography has tended to concentrate the important events in the reigns of the strong emperors (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 295). Because the Tibetan empire saw a period of weak rulers between Srong btsan sGam po and Khri Srong lde btsan, the former would be the only viable candidate to be labeled as the initiator of the translation activities. As an alternative, Scherrer-Schaub (2002, 299) has suggested the possibility that the two sūtras mentioned above were translated at the behest of the Dowager Empress Khri ma lod in the first half of the eighth century. She could have been inspired by the Chinese empress Wu, who used these sutras to authorize her rule.

Even though we cannot know the exact date when translations into Tibetan started to be produced, we can surmise that the process was more individual at the outset, with students of various teachers translating literature that suited their own interests and needs (Dotson 2017, 7). The first Buddhist texts likely reached Tibet from China, Khotan, or other Central Asian territories, which were engaged in the rising diplomatic ties and the vibrant exchange of goods and ideas (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 304). Regardless of what the origins might be, we can be sure that the

large-scale royal translation project commenced after Buddhism became the state religion in the second half of the eighth century (Verhagen 1994, 10) and thrived for the next century until the end of the Tibetan empire. The translation of Buddhist literature picked up again in the *phyi dar* period and can be said to have lasted up to the seventeenth century (Halkias 2004, 47).

Our primary sources for the *snga dar* period, in terms of the transmission of Buddhist literature, are the two extant catalogues, the *Lhan kar ma* and the *'Phang thang ma,* and one of the normative lexicological works, the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, also known by its Sanskrit title *Madhyavyutpatti*. The latter includes a lengthy introduction that pertains to the history of royal authoritative decisions (*bkas bcad*) regarding the translation of Buddhist scriptures and enumerates specific guidelines for translators. As Cristina Scherrer-Schaub remarked, these sources testify to a rigorous organization of the institution of translating right from its beginning, which probably happened shortly after the Indian scholar Śāntarakṣita arrived in Tibet in 763 (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 311). We also know that a committee, called *bCom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs kyi 'dun sa*, was instituted to revise and standardize all produced translations (Verhagen 1994, 10). In addition, the editorial process of scribes in Dunhuang, as studied by Brandon Dotson (2015), can be taken as a piece of further evidence of the high degree of sophistication in the treatment of scriptures.

The translations were carried out in dedicated colleges whose members were carefully selected and well-rewarded (Halkias 2014, 148–49).[4] This level of standardization and supervision over the translations led to very faithful renderings of the originals. Because the terminological equivalents were prescribed, accurate back-translations are possible in many cases. In connection with this, Tibetan translations are sometimes thought to be mechanical and too dependent on the underlying Sanskrit syntax. However, this is not always the case, especially in the case of the translations dating from the *snga dar* period. There are many cases where the choice of terminology is either dependent on context, or there is no recognizable difference between variant words (Ruegg 1998, 124). One can find cases of free translations, which prioritize the meaning over mechanical faithfulness to the grammar of the original (Hahn 2010, 142). Indeed, readability and ease of understanding are issues that the guidelines for translators cared for. While it was preferable to stay close to the text as written in Sanskrit, it was possible to deviate from it when this would impair

---

[4]   It has to be mentioned that for the information about the selection process and funding of the colleges, Halkias cites a contemporary Tibetan work without mentioning what is the historical source of this information. Therefore, the accuracy of this account is unclear.

the clarity of the translation (for more on the guidelines, see below). In the *phyi dar* period, translators started deviating from these standards, and more mechanical translations were produced (Hahn 2010, 143).

It is highly likely that, at first, translations were carried out from many different languages (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 277). As China was a place with an established scholarly tradition where Buddhism entered many centuries prior, Chinese must have occupied a significant position among the source languages of the earliest translations. There are multiple facts from which we can infer that Chinese sources might have played a vital role in the early introduction of Buddhism to Tibet. One is the presence of Chinese and Khotanese monks who found refuge in Tibet under the aegis of the Chinese princess Jincheng, the wife of Khri lDe gtsug btsan. We can also mention the Tibetan presence in Chinese areas, chiefly Dunhuang, during the empire's expansion and the fact that there are records of Tibetans receiving Chinese education (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 276). Even during later times, it seems that the translators did not work exclusively from Sanskrit but used multiple sources. Li (2016, 227) has provided evidence that in some cases, translators reportedly translating from Sanskrit relied on a Chinese source or an earlier translation from Chinese. Nevertheless, the Chinese influence in the early stages of Buddhism in Tibet was downplayed by later historiographers (Li 2016, 208). Even during the imperial period, some translations bear evidence of attempting to camouflage their Chinese source (Stein 2010, 13 [1983]).

Unfortunately, very little is known about the process of translating from Chinese. From Rolf Stein's research on the translations from Chinese found in the library cave at Dunhuang, it seems that there was significantly less standardization. In this respect, the practice of translation resembled the way Buddhist texts were translated into Chinese, where the process was more individual, with the choice of terms dependent on the translator. Bilingual Sanskrit-Chinese lexicons started to appear only in the seventh century. Still, they did not create a fixed standard that had to be followed, which resulted in multiple translations being used for the same term (Braarvig 2018, 428). A similar lack of uniformity can be found in the case of the Tibetan translations from Chinese. After comparing them with the translations from Sanskrit, Rolf Stein came up with the concepts of *Chinese vocabulary* and *Indian vocabulary*, with the former being older than the latter (Stein 2010, 14 [1983]). However, it is interesting that the two vocabularies existed side by side and can be found mixed even within one text (ibid., 10–11). According to Scherrer-Schaub (2002,

303), this blending can also be explained by positing that the early translations from Chinese served as bases for later revisions and retranslations.

3.1. The catalogues of translations

The organization of the royal translation project is also shown in the production of catalogues (*dkar chag*) of translated texts. It is possible that the Tibetans let themselves be inspired by Chinese bureaucracy and orderliness in keeping track of the transmitted literature. As Halkias remarked, listings of translations and indigenous works appear to have been a "quintessentially" Chinese phenomenon, with 76 known catalogues produced (Halkias 2014, 152). As far as we know, the royal translation committee compiled three catalogues named after the palaces where they were produced: *Lhan kar ma*,[5] *'Phang thang ma*, and *mChims phu ma*. Only the first one was available for a long time, being included in the *bsTan 'gyur*. Fortunately, a manuscript of the 'Phang thang ma was found and published by Mi rigs dpe skrun khang in 2003 (rTa rdo 2003). The third catalogue remains missing; nonetheless, some of its contents can be reconstructed from citations in Bu ston's proposed catalogue of the bKa' 'gyur (see Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, xxvii).

Although both extant catalogues provide us with information about the date of their compilation, it is very unclear what are the correspondent Western years. The introduction of the *Lhan kar ma* state that it was compiled in a dragon year at the Lhan dkar palace (Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, 1). Similarly, the *'Phang thang ma* reports that it was compiled in a dog year at the 'Phang thang ka med palace (rTa rdo 2003, 3). According to Bu ston, the *Lhan kar ma* dates to the reign of the emperor Khri Srong lde btsan (Bu ston 1990, 32–33), which would put its compilation date to the year 788. Herrmann-Pfandt argues against this dating because there would not be enough time to translate so many scriptures, and also because the catalogue includes references to the great revision, which likely only started during the reign of Khri lDe srong btsan (Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, xix). Instead, Herrmann-Pfandt proposes 812 as the more likely dating. One of her arguments centers around the ages of the compilers; as far as we know, they were active in the translation project since its beginning, which means that they would be too old were the *Lhan kar ma* compiled

---

[5]   Sometimes written as *lDan kar ma*.

in 824 or 836, the next dragon years (ibid.). Also, drawing on the fact that the catalogue includes a section of not yet revised translations, which only lists two texts, Herrmann-Pfandt argues that it would have been compiled shortly before the great revision was completed in 814[6] (ibid., xx). Brandon Dotson has argued against the year 812 on the basis of the place where the court was residing. He takes into account the Zhwa'i lha khang inscription, which is also dated to a dragon year. In the case of this inscription, 812 is the only viable dating because it was commissioned by the emperor Khri lDe srong btsan, who ruled until 815. The problem arises from the fact that the inscription situates the court to 'On cang do, while it was supposed to reside at Lhan dkar when *Lhan kar ma* was compiled (Dotson 2007, 3). It can also be mentioned that the *Lhan kar ma* includes texts which could have been translated only after 830 because their translator had not been active prior to that year. Herrmann-Pfandt (2008, xxi) explains this by positing a theory that the catalogue could have been reworked multiple times. This, however, calls into question the refutation of 788 as the year of the initial compilation. It would then be possible to speculate that the cataloguing began in the early years of the translation project, and the lists were periodically updated until its end.

Similarly disputable is the precise dating of the *'Phang thang ma*; it is not even clear whether it predates or postdates the *Lhan kar ma*. According to Herrmann-Pfandt, the *'Phang thang ma* must have been compiled before the *Lhan kar ma*. She presents three arguments for this; For one, the divisions of *'Phang thang ma* supposedly show an earlier stage in the development of thematic sorting. Furthermore, this catalogue includes more unrevised or unfinished texts. Lastly, the *Lhan kar ma* lists more tantric texts, which could signify compliance with the royal proscription on translations of this genre. In light of these arguments, the proposed dating is 806 (Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, xxv). Georgios Halkias (2004, 48) holds the opposite opinion, concluding that the *'Phang thang ma* is the youngest of the catalogues. He argues with the fact that the compilers mention having access to other catalogues, and by the inclusion of *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, which was most likely composed in 814 (ibid., 55). In addition, the *'Phang thang ma* includes a text attributed to the emperor Khri 'U'i dum brtan. According to Dotson (2007, 4), this puts the compilation date to 842 at the earliest, possibly to the reign of Khri 'U'i dum brtan's successor 'Od srung, who supposedly resided in 'Phang thang for much of his reign. However, the colophon of

---

[6]   However, it is not clear that the great revision ended in 814, it is possible that it continued even beyond the reign of Khri lDe srong btsan, see below.

the extant manuscript mentions that the catalogue was compiled in the reign of Khri gTsug lde btsan, which led Halkias (2004, 77) to consider the possibility that it was, in fact, an open register. The fact that Herrmann-Pfandt proposed the same theory in the case of *Lhan kar ma* makes it an appealing hypothesis.

As for the contents of the catalogues, the *Lhan kar ma* lists 737 texts across 27 divisions, while the *'Phang thang ma* has 960 titles across 32 divisions (Halkias 2004, 65). First come specific sets of sūtras: the *Prajñāpāramitā*, *Avataṃsaka*, and *Ratnakūṭa* followed by various other sūtras, śāstras, tantric texts and dhāraṇīs, vinaya literature, and commentaries. Included are also works composed by Tibetan authors, including the emperors. This manner of sorting scriptures can be seen as a predecessor to the later divisions within the *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur* (Herrmann-Pfandt 2002, 135).

The catalogues reveal, among other things, a continuing lessening of the importance of Chinese sources. The *'Phang thang ma* lists eleven translations from Chinese, while *Lhan kar ma* reports 22 (rTa rdo 2003, 19; Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, 133–49). Some texts said to have a Chinese source in the *Lhan kar ma* are given as translations from Sanskrit in the *'Phang thang ma*. Li (2016, 209) takes this to mean that the texts were either replaced or the textual information was tampered with. In addition, it is possible to find sūtras that betray reliance on a Chinese source even though they claim to be based on a Sanskrit original (ibid., 214).

Another striking difference between the two catalogues lies in the number of texts of Tibetan authorship. While the *Lhan kar ma* only has seven, the *'Phang thang ma* reports 126 (Halkias 2004, 68). Perhaps, this can be taken as another piece of evidence for the relative chronology of the two lists. As more time passed with Buddhism as the royally sponsored religion, there would have been more educated Tibetans able to produce their own treatises and commentaries. The *Lhan kar ma* also includes fewer translations in the tantra section, which Herrmann-Pfandt (2008, lvii) connects with the limitation on their translation. However, it appears that the list is not exhaustive, and the higher tantras were either catalogued separately or not included in the official lists at all, which is a theory both Herrmann-Pfandt (2002, 143) and Halkias (2004, 71) have put forward.

3.2. The systematization and royal control of the translation process

Connected with the translation project are the *three royal decrees* (*bkas bcad gsum*). What are they? Dorji Wangchuk (2020, 949) has shown that there are at least four different referents of this term found in various sources. The first set is found in the two Tibetan explanatory dictionaries, *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* and *Dung dkar tshig mdzod chen mo,* under the entries "*bkas bcad rnam pa gsum*" and "*bkas bcad chen po rnam pa gsum*" respectively. According to them, the three decrees refer to the ordinances of Khri gTsug lde btsan pertaining to the establishment of the Mūlasarvāstivāda as the only vinaya lineage to be present in Tibet, the prohibition on the translation of tantric scriptures belonging to the *Yoginī* class, and the creation of standards of weights and measures (Wangchuk 2020, 949–51). The next three are more closely connected to the royal control over the translation process itself. The second set, found among later Tibetan historiographers, consists of the three normative lexicographical works, *Mahāvyutpatti*, *Madhyavyutpatti*, and *Svalpavyutpatti* (ibid., 952–53), which will be dealt with in more detail below. The third set, found in the works of two Tibetan scholars from the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, is not limited to the *snga dar* period; it comprises three waves of terminological-orthographical standardization. The first one should be the initial decree ordering the first translations, and the second one the great revision that happened in the first half of the ninth century. The third decree, or rather phase of translation, occurred after the imperial period, during the *phyi dar* (ibid., 958–59).

The fourth set of referents is based on Cristina Scherrer-Schaub's thorough textual study of the edict found at the beginning of the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*.[7] It mentions three authoritative decisions. These decrees show a high degree of royal involvement in the translation process through commissioning normative works and founding regulatory boards. They also show a progressively higher degree of sophistication in the organization of the translation project. The latest edict concerns the formulation of more strict guidelines for translation and fixing prescribed terminological equivalents and the revision of all previously translated texts to make them conform to the new regulations. It can be dated with a high degree of certainty to the year 814 during the reign of Khri lDe srong btsan (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 281). Scherrer-Schaub (2002, 285) surmises that the middle edict was occasioned by a certain anarchy among the translation colleges, which

---

[7] Dealt with in Wangchuk (2020, 966–68). Henceforth, Scherrer-Schaub's study will be cited directly.

started to standardize their own vocabularies without recourse to a central regulatory body. This second edict can be situated to the time of Khri Srong lde btsan, although the exact year is unclear, both 783 and 795 are possible. Panglung (1994, 167) favors the latter year, reasoning that the decree was issued when the court resided at the place where Khri Srong lde btsan retired in the last years of his reign. However, based on diplomatic analysis, Scherrer-Schaub (2002, 314) considers the former year much more likely. Scherrer-Schaub also observes that this middle edict testifies to the existence of normative principles before the now extant lexicographical texts were created, although the translation procedure had been somewhat less standardized or institutionalized (ibid., 286). The information about the earliest authoritative decision is terse; nevertheless, it is clear that, at the very least, the terminology used in translations from Sanskrit was regularized from the very beginning (ibid., 294). It is said that it happened on the occasion of the translation of the *Ratnamegha* and *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra*s. As mentioned above, these two scriptures are generally recognized as the first two translated texts, done supposedly already by Thon mi Saṃbhoṭa. The edict in *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* only mentions that it happened during the time of "Divine Son, the Father" (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 292).[8]

A significant milestone in the royal translation project was the so-called Great revision (*skad gsar bcad*), which was a reform of the written standard of the Tibetan language pertaining both to terminology and orthography. Many Tibetan historiographers situated it to the reign of Khri gTsug lde btsan, including Bu ston (1990, 44–45). However, the overwhelming scholarly consensus is that this is a mistake born from the conflation of Khri gTsug lde btsan and Khri lDe srong btsan and that the revision was initiated by the latter (Uray 1989, 5; Khangkar 1993, 17; Herrmann-Pfandt 2002, 135; Halkias 2004, 51). Nevertheless, we can also wonder whether some form of revision began already in the reign of Khri Srong lde btsan with the second authoritative decision, as stipulated by Hu-von Hinüber (1997, 183). As will be explained below, this was likely the occasion on which the first normative lexicographical treatises were created, which could prompt speculation that older translations were made to conform to the new terminology. Furthermore, while it is certain that the Great revision proper was initiated by Khri lDe srong btsan, both Uray (1989, 17) and Halkias (2004, 54) pointed out that the revision would have likely lasted for many years, which means that it was carried out mainly under the reign of Khri gTsug lde btsan.

---

[8] Scherrer-Schaub mentions that "Divine Son, the Father" refers to Khri lDe srong btsan. However, this must be a mistake; perhaps Khri Srong btsan alias Srong btsan sGam po was meant.

3.3. The three *vyutpatti*-treatises

As previously described, the successive authoritative decisions were prescribing standards for translation and terminological centralization, including the process of fixing new terms, which will be described in more detail below. These norms, which translators were expected to conform to, were codified in a set of lexicographical works generally collectively called the *vyutpatti*-treatises. *Vyutpatti*, in Tibetan *bye brag tu rtogs byed*, is a genre designation that is included in their titles. However, the treatises are known by various names, which will be mentioned below. According to Ruegg, *vyutpatti* may refer to the derivation or etymology of words, but in the case of the present treatises, it should be understood as "explanatory register or repertory" (Ruegg 1998, 116).

Three treatises were reportedly created: the Great, Middle, and Small, their Sanskrit titles being *Mahāvyutpatti*, *Madhyavyutpatti*, and *Svalpavyutpatti*. Although *Madhyavyutpatti* is more commonly known by the Tibetan title *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*. Only the first two works are extant, although, as will be explained below, it is possible that the *Svalpavyutpatti* was not lost but rather merged into other works.

3.3.1. *Mahāvyutpatti*

The longest lexicographical work is called *Mahāvyutpatti* in Sanskrit, and *Bye brag tu rtogs byed chen po* in Tibetan. According to Verhagen, the title can be translated as "great (treatise on) analytical instruction (on words)" (Verhagen 1994, 15). Going by Ruegg's translation of *vyutpatti* mentioned above, the title can also be rendered as "The Great Repertory". Interestingly, in the introduction to *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 317),[9] it is referred to simply as *dkar chag*, i.e., a catalogue. The *Mahāvyutpatti* is essentially a Sanskrit-Tibetan dictionary, ordered not alphabetically but thematically. Thematic ordering, instead of alphabetical, has parallels in Indian onomasiological lexicons, which express the meanings of their entries through full or partial synonyms (Ruegg 1998, 117). It lists 9565 entries across 283 categories (Halkias 2014, 154). The entries can be said to be ordered according to importance, beginning with terms

---

[9]   Found also in Bu ston's *Chos 'byung*, where he cites the introduction (Bu ston 1990, 45).

pertaining to the Buddha and the bodhisattvas and ending with names of animals, plants, and geographical locations (Braarvig 2018, 435). The treatise has been preserved in the Peking and sDe dge versions of the *bsTan 'gyur* (Halkias 2004, 49).

It has been shown that the thematic divisions and the order of terms within them were extracted from various scriptures. Ulrich Pagel (2007, 154) has proposed a division of the rubrics into three types: those that reproduce established lists, whose source can be located; those that contain specific but widely used content, which makes it impossible to trace the exact origin of the list in *Mahāvyutpatti*; lists created ad-hoc by the compilers of the treatise, who were drawing on multiple texts. As for the first type, two significant sources have been identified: the *Ratnamegha sūtra* and Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra*. Hu-von Hinüber (1997, 185) has estimated that up to 15 % to 20 % of the whole treatise consists of terms related to monastic matters. Interestingly, this vocabulary has not been extracted directly from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, but its summary composed by Guṇaprabha (ibid., 196).[10] For matters unrelated to *vinaya*, the *Ratnamegha sūtra* has been identified as the primary source. The sūtra contains many lists, making it a fitting source for a terminological dictionary (Pagel 2007, 157). Scherrer-Schaub (2002, 331–32) has demonstrated that within multiple categories, the order in which the entries are listed in the *Mahāvyutpatti* follows the order of their appearance in the sūtra.

3.3.2. *Svalpavyutpatti*

The supposedly shortest of the lexicographical treatises was the *Svalpavyutpatti* or *Bye brag tu rtogs byed chung ngu*.[11] The text has not been preserved, and it seems it has been lost already in the fourteenth century in the time of Bu ston (Wangchuk 2020, 954).[12] Scherrer-Schaub has speculated that the *Svalpavyutpatti* could have been the very first treatise to be produced, already

---

[10]   Tangentially, this suggests that the preference for the *Vinayasūtra* over the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya* itself in matters of monastic discipline is not a phenomenon that developed later in Tibet, but that it was a convention the Tibetans picked up from their Indian predecessors.

[11]   The Sanskrit name of this treatise is not clear, *Svalpavyutpatti* is commonly used today, although *Kṣudravyutpatti and Alpavyutpatti* have also been proposed (see Uray 1989, 3; Ishikawa 1990, 127; Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 306).

[12]   Pagel (2007, 152) cites Ruegg (1998, 121) in saying that the *Svalpavyutpatti* has been available to Bu ston. However, Ruegg's article contains no such claim.

during the period of the first standardization of translations. It could have possibly been a monolingual list of terms excerpted from the Ratnamegha, similar to texts in the *chos kyi rnam grangs* genre. These are quasi-encyclopedias enumerating terms distributed in thematic categories with the intention of clarifying their meaning and showing the connections among them (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 307). This list could have later served as the basis for the *Mahāvyutpatti*, with which it would have been merged (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 316; see also Verhagen 2015, 188). Wangchuk (2020, 954) cites a contemporary Tibetan scholar 'Phrin las chos grags who claims that the Tibetan oral tradition identifies the *Svalpavyutpatti* with the work *Chos kyi rnam grangs kyi brjed byang*, which was supposedly composed by dPal brtsegs, an important translator of the early period who was among the compilers of both the catalogues of translations and the vyutpatti-treatises.

3.3.3. *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*

Now, we turn our attention to the main topic of this thesis, the *Madhyavyutpatti* or *Middle [length] repertory*, in Tibetan *Bye brag tu rtogs byed 'bring po.* It is widely known by the title *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*. The exact meaning of this title is slightly unclear; *bam po* can be understood as a unit of length of texts or as 'volume'. If we understand *gnyis pa* as one word, "second", the title would be "The Second Volume on the Formation of Words". In that case, however, it is uncertain what is the first volume. Should it perhaps be the *Mahāvyutpatti*, since the *Madhyavyutpatti* has been sometimes labeled as its commentary?[13] That would be a speculative solution, especially because the relative chronology of the two treatises is impossible to determine (Verhagen 1994, 19). A more feasible solution is to consider the title as referring to its two parts: the introduction and the glossary. Even though the two parts are not equally long, or even exactly a *bam po* in length, this theory is confirmed by the closing formula of the introduction in the Tabo version (Panglung 1994, 171). Thus, Verhagen's (1988, 23) translation of the title is "(Treatise on) the Formation of Words Consisting of Two Volumes".

As previously mentioned, *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* is divided into two parts. The first part contains an introduction explaining the authoritative decision connected with the treatise as

---

[13]   For example, in the title of Ishikawa's (1990) critical edition: *A Critical Edition of the sGra sbyor bam po gnyis-pa: An Old and Basic Commentary on the Mahāvyutpatti*.

well as the previous authoritative decisions pertaining to the translation project, which have already been covered above. Then, specific guidelines for translators are enumerated. The second part is a glossary consisting of 413 Sanskrit terms (Verhagen 2001, 68). Each term is explained in accordance with traditional Indian hermeneutics and etymology, and a translation into Tibetan is fixed. The entries are further divided into fifty thematic divisions, similar to the *Mahāvyutpatti*.

There are three extant versions of the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*. The most well-known is the one included in the Peking and sDe dge *bsTan 'gyur*. A fragmentary version not too dissimilar from the canonical one has been found at Dunhuang. In addition, there is one unique manuscript of the treatise, discovered in Tabo, which contains a complete introduction and a fragmentary glossary part. The introduction of the Tabo version is significantly shorter (Panglung 1994, 164), and the translation guidelines are also less elaborate (ibid., 171). It is very likely that the Tabo fragment is a witness of an earlier version of the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, perhaps identical with the second authoritative decision promulgated by Khri Srong lde btsan as described in the canonical version (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 271). Nevertheless, the preserved lexicographical part of the Tabo manuscript does not seem to be significantly divergent from the canonical and Dunhuang versions (Verhagen 2015, 184). This suggests that although the earlier version had not explicitly explained them, the editors had already been familiar with some of the translation techniques for fixing vocabulary equivalents, as they had applied them in the explanations of the terms. On the other hand, it also shows a growing need for standardization and greater awareness of the intricacies of translation (ibid., 185).

The dating of both the canonical / Dunhuang and the Tabo versions has already been covered when discussing the three authoritative decisions (*bkas bcad gsum*). As has been argued by Géza Uray (1989, 12–13), the date for the canonical version, as well as for the *vyutpatti* treatises as a whole, is 814, which is also the year associated with the great revision (*skad gsar bcad*) (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 280–81). The version of the Tabo manuscript can be dated to either 783 or 795 (Panglung 1994, 167).

Scherrer-Schaub (2002) has aptly demonstrated that the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* can be understood and studied as a document of ecclesiastical chancery. It should be approached as a complex text, "at once a vademecum destined for translators, a public act, and a richly argued lexicographical commentary." (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 279). While analyzing it as a complex charter, Scherrer-Schaub has divided the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* into three main parts: 1) the

protocol of the act, i.e., the introduction which mentions the three authoritative decisions related to the procedure of translating Buddhist texts; 2) the main body of the act consisting of the lexical commentary, which is introduced by the last sentence of the protocol. There, it is said that previously, some terms have not been decided or fixed, so they are going to be explained in conformity with Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna treatises and grammatical works; 3) the eschatocol, the final part of the charter, which is found only in the canonical version, and confirms the decision and authenticates the document (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 279–80). In what follows, the introductory part of the treatise will be discussed in two parts, as an edict and as a translation manual. A large portion of the former has already been covered above in the context of the three authoritative decisions, so the discussion here will focus on the motivation for promulgating the edict and on the prescribed procedure for fixing a normative translation of a new term.

In the introduction to the 814 version of the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, it is stated that the creation of normative treatises was prompted by previous translators using novel religious terms, which were not only unfamiliar to Tibetans but also at times diverged from the doctrinal texts and grammatical conventions. (Schaeffer, Kapstein, and Tuttle 2013, 73–74). Although the Tabo version does not explicitly mention this motive, it is clear that it refers to the period of the first translations. This is evidenced by the fact that the Tabo version, i.e., the earlier draft of the treatise, already contained the lexicological part, which means that the problem of arbitrary translation choices has already been dealt with to some degree. As such, the 814 edict can perhaps be seen not as a completely new initiative on the part of Khri lDe srong btsan but as a reconfirmation of his father's authoritative decision with the principles of translation spelled out in more detail.

We can already find a stipulation in the Tabo version that the ways of translating presented in the normative treatises are binding, and no one is to create new terminology of their own accord. If new terms are encountered, their translation has to be fixed on the level of the translation colleges. A proposition that conforms to the established guidelines must be submitted to the central authority, where permission to use the new translation will be issued and the term included in the normative lexicon (Panglung 1994, 165). The description of the procedure is not significantly different in the 814 version; following the general trend of the whole introduction, it is only described in slightly more detail (Schaeffer, Kapstein, and Tuttle 2013, 75). As mentioned by

Scherrer-Schaub (2002, 305), the edicts reflect a well-established administrative organization functional in the translation project.

Both extant versions also deal with the problem of translating tantric literature. It is stressed that it is supposed to be kept secret and not revealed to unfit people. The Tabo version limits the translation efforts, making it necessary to receive permission, which will only be awarded to "excellent scholars" with the ability to translate the text without any interference in its meaning (Panglung 1994, 165). The canonical version is stricter, virtually prohibiting the translation of tantric literature. It mentions that while it had been permitted to translate and practice tantras, there have been those who took their meaning literally and took up wrong practices. It also complains about the existence of haphazard translations of tantras (Schaeffer, Kapstein, and Tuttle 2013, 75–76).

In addition to the information about the royal authoritative decisions, the introduction of the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* includes specific guidelines translators are to conform to. The points presented in these guidelines show attentiveness to the unique features of both Sanskrit and Tibetan grammar, and concern for making the translations understandable in Tibetan. It is explicitly stated that, when possible, the grammar of the translation should conform to the original. However, in cases where doing so would interfere with the clearness of language, translating to the advantage of intelligibility in Tibetan has precedence over keeping close to the original syntax, which includes the possibility of changing the arrangement of verses within a stanza (Scherrer-Schaub 1999, 72). This concession may be something the Royal translation committee arrived at only after the second authoritative decision, as it is not found in the Tabo version. There, only the ideal standard is described where a translation accords with both the meaning and syntax of the original (Panglung 1994, 164).

After stating this standard, the Tabo version only adds an injunction to use honorific terms for the Buddha and his *bodhisattva* and *śrāvaka* disciples. In other matters, translators are to follow the standards set out in the translations of the *Ratnamegha* and *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra*s (ibid., 165). As expected, the 814 version elaborates on the translation principles.[14] For polysemous words where

---

[14]   A full English translation of these principles can be found in Sources of the Tibetan Tradition (Schaeffer, Kapstein, and Tuttle 2013, 74–75) or Braarvig (2018, 431–32).

a single Tibetan word would not be able to capture the various meanings, the Sanskrit term is to be kept. Similarly, in the cases of difficult to translate words, such as names of regions, flowers, or beings, the edict allows for the borrowing of the Sanskrit word accompanied by a classifier hinting at its meaning. Thus, we can find translations such as *me tog pa d+ma* (lotus) or *yul ma ga d+hA* (Magadha), where the Tibetan words *me tog* and *yul* indicate that the expression refers to a flower and a region, respectively. Furthermore, the guidelines allow for numbers which are expressed in a difficult way in Sanskrit to be conformed to a more straightforward Tibetan way. An interesting instruction, which was not followed in some of the later translations, deals with the Sanskrit verbal prefixes. Sometimes, a prefix does not change the meaning of a verb in any significant way (or in a way that can be expressed in translation). In these cases, the prefix does not have to be reflected in Tibetan.

3.4. Translation in later Tibetan literature

The royal translation project ended together with the fall of the Tibetan empire in the second half of the ninth century. When the second wave of transmitting Buddhism to Tibet began a century later, a revived zeal for translation appeared with it as well. This time, there was no central authority to impose normative prescriptions or restrict the type of texts which could be translated, which allowed for a surge in translations of tantric literature. Nevertheless, even though the translation guidelines were not always followed, which meant that more mechanical translations were produced (Hahn 2010, 143), the translators of the *phyi dar* period did not terminologically deviate from the earlier conventions.

The two *vyutpatti* treatises were not the only bilingual tools the later translators had access to. They also had at their disposal the newly translated Sanskrit monolingual lexicographical works, such as the *Amarakośa*, an important onomasiological dictionary, or various *dhātupāṭha*s, lists of verbal roots (Verhagen 2015, 191). The continued relative consistency in the translations of the *phyi dar* period could, in fact, be explained by the existence of these lexicons and their popularity. The scholar Sa skya Paṇḍita, for instance, stressed the importance of their use (Verhagen 2017, 250).

In the eighteenth century, there was an effort to translate the Tibetan canon into Mongolian, which prompted the creation of similar lexicographical works as were the *vyutpatti* treatises. The most remarkable of these is the *Dag yig mkhas pa'i 'byung gnas*, which has been called a *Mongolian Mahāvyutpatti* (Sárközi 1980). This extensive list of terms is based on a monolingual Tibetan list compiled by lCang skya sprul sku Rol pa'i rdo rje in 1741–42 (Ruegg 1973, 243). It contains around 9600 entries across 275 thematic chapters covering a wide range of topics (Sárközi 1980, 221). This treatise also presents translation guidelines, which in many respects copy those already found in the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* and elaborates on them. For example, it adds a note about the importance of translating expressions of praise, blame, surprise, or dejection with a similarly emotionally charged Mongolian word (Ruegg 1973, 254). Interestingly, it also forbids correcting mistakes found in the Tibetan texts based on expositions of various teachers so as not to introduce confusion stemming from different systems of thought (ibid.).

In addition, the works of both Sa skya Paṇḍita and Si tu Paṇ chen also include reflections on the methods of translation and presentations of the principles of establishing new terms, drawing predominantly on the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*. These will be mentioned in the next chapter.

4. Analyzing terms in the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*

In this chapter, we will take a closer look at the methods used by the compilers of *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* when analyzing words and determining a specific translation. Then, in the next chapter, the first area of the treatise, the epithets of the Buddha, will be presented in more detail. It is stated in the introduction that terminology is established in accordance with Indian commentaries and grammatical treatises. Indeed, it can be seen that the compilers were familiar with Indian exegetical manuals, chiefly Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*. This work stems from the North Indian Buddhist scholarly environment but has parallels also in Pali canonical texts *Peṭakopadesa* and *Nettipakaraṇa* (Scherrer-Schaub 1999, 70).

In the analyses, various types of approaches to both translation and etymology can be seen. Some of these were already described by Tibetan scholars. First, we can mention Si tu Paṇ chen's division of words into *'dod rgyal gyi sgra*, "random" words, meaning that they cannot be analyzed because their meaning is assigned arbitrarily, and *rjes sgrub kyi sgra*, "derivative" words, whose etymology can be explained (Verhagen 2001, 65–66). Furthermore, the translations fixed for various terms in the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* are also applications of the principles set out in the introduction (Scherrer-Schaub 2002, 305). Si tu Paṇ chen illustrates this by taking three principles and providing specific examples for each. It is said that for composite words, their constituents are to be identified and explained, which is the case of the term *samyak-sam-buddha*, which is divided into three parts indicated here by hyphens (Verhagen 2001, 74). Easier terms are to be translated by a simple literal translation, as in the case of *dānamaya-puṇya-kriyā-vastu*, where each of the constituent words is given a one-to-one translation (ibid., 74–75). The third principle that Si tu Paṇ chen mentions is establishing a translation based on a term's contextual meaning. The example word is *arhat*, which is translated into Tibetan as *dgra bcom pa* (ibid., 75).

The translation of the term *arhat* is based on a doctrinal explanation rather than linguistic etymology, which brings us to a dichotomy found among the analyses in the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*. It was first described by Ruegg, who pointed out the difference between *morphological-historical derivation* and *hermeneutical etymology*, where the former is a standard linguistic analysis while the latter is based on doctrinal connotations (Ruegg 1998, 118–19). Ruegg also explained that it would be short-sighted to simply dismiss hermeneutical etymology as incorrect or

naïve. In some cases, including the entry *arhat*, it is used beside morphological derivation, adding conceptual associations (ibid., 119). Verhagen has also remarked that "the hermeneutical etymology emphasizes and elucidates aspects of function and meaning that remain largely hidden from the eye when merely a strictly grammatical analysis is applied to the term." (Verhagen 2001, 71). As such, hermeneutical etymology has been an important exegetical method for the Buddhist scholastic tradition. In the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, it has been unmistakably used fourteen times (ibid., 68).

Further, one more dichotomy can be presented: between *sgra 'gyur*, or convention / sense-based translation, and *don 'gyur*, or intention / reference-based translation (Verhagen 2015, 184). This concept is closely related to the one presented above; the difference being that while the previous concept dealt with how a term is analyzed, this one is about its translation. Typically, the terms which are translated on the basis of their meaning, i.e., *don 'gyur*, this meaning will be arrived at through hermeneutical etymology (Verhagen 2017, 252). As explained by Sa skya Paṇḍita, an example of one word being translated according to these two different methods is *praṇidhāna*, which can be rendered by its conventional meaning as *smon lam* (prayer), or by its doctrinal explanation as *yongs su bsgyur ba* (lit. transformation) (Verhagen 2017, 256).

Finally, Verhagen (1994, 20–34) delineated four strategies of Sanskrit analysis found in the various entries of *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*. He found that even though no translations of Sanskrit grammatical works date from this period, the compilers were drawing on them in more than half of the entries to analyze the Sanskrit terms (Verhagen 1994, 20). The most common strategy found in 110 entries is simply providing a paraphrase, which clarifies the meaning according to its morphological-historical or hermeneutical etymology. The second approach is similar to the first one but applicable in the case of compounds. In this case, the constituents are separated, and each is given a paraphrase. In the third strategy, suffixes are isolated from the main word and explained according to their semantic or morphological properties. Finally, in some entries, the verbal root of the term is extracted and clarified by citing a *dhātupāṭha* entry. The strategy used for each of the fourteen entries of the first thematic area will be pointed out in the next chapter.

5. Epithets of the Buddha: the first thematic area of the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*

The terms which were selected for translation in this thesis belong to the first thematic division of *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*. The title of this division is *sangs rgyas kyi mtshan gyi rnam grangs*, which can be translated as *synonyms for the names of buddhas*. As can be guessed from the title, what is covered here are different kinds of epithets, a type of term that can pose particular difficulties in translation. For example, it can be unclear how to deal with epithets comprised of otherwise common words, which thus do not carry honorific connotations, or those which are not used exclusively for the Buddha. Some epithets can also be problematic because of their components' polysemous or semantically unclear nature. As an example, we can take a very commonly used title of the Buddha: *bhagavat*. Some English translators choose to express the exalted connotations of the word and translate it as *Lord*, which has no direct connection to the elements of the Sanskrit term but instead draws on established religious terminology carrying a similar meaning. Others instead choose to interpret the meaning of *bhaga* and arrive at a more literal translation: *Blessed one*. Still others, perhaps not wishing to attach unwanted connotations or incorrectly interpret its components, simply leave the term untranslated. Therefore, it is helpful to know how the early Tibetan translators dealt with the problem of translating epithets and how traditional Buddhist hermeneutics explained them. As most of the terms stem from common Buddhist literature, in some cases, attention will also be given to the glosses given in Pāli commentarial literature.

The Tibetan text comes from Mie Ishikawa's (1990, 5–13) critical edition, which is based both on Dunhuang manuscripts and canonical versions. In some cases, the analyzed Sanskrit term is given in the nominative singular form. This has been changed to the neutral, or "dictionary", form of the term in the translations. Also, the Sanskrit parts of the analyses have been put into italics for easier orientation.

The first thematic area, the epithets of the Buddha, analyses fourteen terms. The first ten are excerpted from a standard formula for recollecting the qualities of the Buddha. In the Tibetan canon, the list can be found, for instance, in a text included in the bKa' 'gyur by the name of *The*

noble recollection of the Buddha.[15] The formula stems from a common Buddhist heritage, and can also be found in the Pāli tradition.

1. buddha

buddhaḥ zhes bya ba sgra las drangs na gcig tu na / *mohanidrāpramattabuddhapuruṣavat* ces bya ste / gti mug gi gnyid sangs pas na mi gnyid sangs pa bzhin te / sangs pa la snyegs pa / yang rnam pa gcig tu na / *buddher vikāśanād buddha vibuddha-padmavat* ces bya ste / blo bye zhing rgyas pas na padma kha bye zhing rgyas pa dang 'dra bar yang bshad de sangs rgyas shes bya'o // tshigs gi don spyir na chos thams cad thugs su chud cing ma lus par byang chub pa la bya /

buddha – according to one literal interpretation: *mohanidrāpramattabuddhapuruṣavat*, [which means] like a person who is awake due to having cleared away the sleep of confusion.[16] [Therefore,] we arrive at 'awakened' (*sangs pa*). It is also explained as *buddher vikāśanād buddhavibuddhapadmavat*, [which means] similar to a lotus which has bloomed and expanded, due to having opened and expanded the intellect.[17] [Therefore, *buddha*] is to be understood as 'awakened-extended' (*sangs rgyas*). The general meaning of the word is 'one who has realized all *dharma*s and completely awakened'.

In this first entry, we are dealing with the interesting choice of the Tibetan translators to use both the convention-based and the reference-based translation simultaneously. The primary meaning of the first part of the Tibetan term, *sangs*, is *to clear away*, which does not seem to be directly connected to the Sanskrit root *√budh*, whose semantic field is related to gaining consciousness or understanding (Monier-Williams 1899, 733). We find this discrepancy also reflected in the explanation of the term *sangs rgyas* in a contemporary Tibetan dictionary: "*sangs pa* means the complete elimination of the obscurations of afflictions and the obscurations of

---

[15]   In Sanskrit: *āryabuddhānusmṛti*. In Tibetan: *'phags pa sangs rgyas rjes su dran pa* (D 279 mdo sde *ya* 54b).
[16]   A more literal translation of the Sanskrit would be "like a person who is awakened due to not being inattentive because of the sleep of confusion." Braarvig (2018, 433) uses an unattested reading of the Sanskrit: *mohanidrāprabuddhatvāt prabuddhapuruṣavat*, which is a direct back-translation of the Tibetan.
[17]   The Sanskrit is a clever play on words: *buddhi* = *blo* = intellect, *buddhavibuddha* = *vikāśana* = *kha bye zhing rgyas pa* = bloom and expand.

wisdom."[18] However, the translation of the Sanskrit citation suggests that *sangs* was abbreviated from the expression *gnyid sangs*: *to clear away sleep*, i.e., *to awaken*. The second part, *rgyas*, originates from a hermeneutical etymology based on a play on words. In Dung dkar's dictionary, the explanation of this part is as follows: "*rgyas pa* means directly perceiving everything that is to be known."[19] From among the strategies of analysis explained by Verhagen, this entry uses the most common one, where the translation is justified by a paraphrase (Verhagen 1994, 21).

2. bhagavat

bhagavān zhes bya ba gcig tu na / *bhagnamāracatuṣṭayatvād bhagavān* zhes bya ste / bdud bzhi bcom pas na bcom pa la bya / yang rnam pa gcig tu na *bhaga* ni legs pa rnam pa drug gi ming ste / gzugs dang / grags pa dang / dbang phyug dang / dpal dang / shes rab dang / brtson pa ste / 'di drug gi spyi la bya / *vān* zhes 'byung ba ni *bhago 'syāstīti bhagavān* zhes ldan par bshad de / rnam grangs 'di skad du bya ba las sngar bsgyur ba'i tshig grags pa btsan par bya ste / bcom ldan 'das shes bya ba ni mdo sde dag las sangs rgyas kyi yon tan la mtshan 'jig rten las 'das pa'o zhes kyang 'byung bas na / 'jig rten pa'i lha *bhagavān* las khyad par du 'das shes bla thabs su bsnan te / bcom ldan 'das shes btags / 'jig rten pa'i *bhagavān* zhes bya ba ni 'jig rten pa'i gzhung nyid las kyang bcom par mi 'chad pas 'jig rten pa'i *bhagavān* ni legs ldan zhes gdags /

bhagavat – according to one [interpretation]: *bhagnamāracatuṣṭayatvād bhagavān*, [which means] he has destroyed the four maras, therefore [he is] the destroyer (*bcom pa*). It is also [explained] thus: *bhaga* is a name for the six excellences, i.e., form, fame, power, fortune, wisdom, effort. Generally, these six [are enumerated]. *Vān* is explained as *bhago 'syāstīti bhagavān*, [which means] having (*ldan*).[20] [Now,] words commonly [used] in previous translations have to be emended according to this synonym. Destroyer-having-transcended (*bcom ldan 'das*) is a name for the

18   "sangs pa ni nyon mongs kyi sgrib pa dang shes bya'i sgrib pa kun spangs zin pa'i don …" (Dung dkar Blo bzang 'Phrin las 2002, 2028).
19   "rgyas pa ni shes bya thams cad mngon sum du mkhyen pa'i don yin /" (Dung dkar Blo bzang 'Phrin las 2002, 2028)
20   The Sanskrit literally means 'one who has goodness, i.e., *bhagavat*'.

quality of the Buddha [expressed] in the sutras [signifying that he has] transcended the world. To differentiate [the Buddha's title] from the [title] *bhagavat* [used in the case of] worldly gods, 'transcended' (*'das*) has been added. [The translation] has been fixed as 'destroyer-having-transcended' (*bcom ldan 'das*). Concerning the [title] *bhagavat* [used in the case of] worldly [beings] in the worldly texts, it is not explained as 'destroyer', therefore the [translation of] the worldly [use of] *bhagavat* is fixed as 'having excellence (*legs ldan*).

In this case, the compilers also decided to combine multiple explanations of a word in the Tibetan translation. Just like in the previous entry, both the historical and hermeneutical etymology have been incorporated in a piecemeal fashion. For the constituent *bhaga*, a hermeneutical etymology was employed to arrive at the translation 'destroyer' (*bcom*). Then, the more straightforward meaning of *bhaga* is mentioned to make sense of the -*vat* suffix, but only the translation of the suffix is kept in the fixed term. Interestingly, an extra word was added, which is not motivated hermeneutically, i.e., it does not originate from an explanation of the word or its part. Furthermore, a contextual alternative is fixed for the cases when *bhagavat* refers to worldly deities. In this case, the hermeneutical etymology was not applicable anymore, so a convention-based translation was established. In this entry, two strategies are employed, both paraphrase and morphological explanation of a suffix (Verhagen 1994, 25).

The connection of *bhaga* with the expression *bhagna* (destroyed, vanquished) can also be found in the Pali canonical commentary *Mahāniddesa*, where *bhagavat* is glossed as follows: "he destroyed lust, therefore *bhagavat*, he destroyed hatred, therefore *bhagavat*, he destroyed confusion, therefore *bhagavat*, he destroyed pride, therefore *bhagavat*, he destroyed wrong views, therefore *bhagavat*, he destroyed obstacles, therefore *bhagavat*, he destroyed obscurations, therefore *bhagavat*."[21] The word is then connected to other expressions as well, most importantly *bhāgin* (endowed with), which is connected to an enumeration of his material possessions and spiritual capabilities.

---

[21] "bhaggarāgoti bhagavā, bhaggadosoti bhagavā, bhaggamohoti bhagavā, bhaggamānoti bhagavā, bhaggadiṭṭhīti bhagavā, bhaggakaṇḍakoti bhagavā, bhaggakilesoti bhagavā" (Nd1 II 480).

3. tathāgata

tathāgata zhes bya ba *tathā* ni de bzhin / *gata* ni gshegs pa'am byon pa'am mkhyen pa'am gsungs pa la bya ste / tshig gi don spyir na sngon gyi sangs rgyas rnams ji ltar gshegs shing phyin pa dang / chos thams cad kyi rang bzhin de bzhin nyid ji lta ba bzhin du mkhyen zhing gsungs pa la bya mod kyi / sngar grags pa bzhin de bzhin gshegs pa zhes gdags /

tathāgata – tathā [means] thus. *Gata* means gone or come or knowing or explaining. In general, the meaning of the word [is understood as referring to] how buddhas came and went, and how they understood and explained the suchness of the nature of all *dharma*s. However, the earlier popularized [translation] 'thus come / gone' (*de bzhin gshegs pa*) is fixed.

The third entry, the very common title *tathāgata*, receives only a short and straightforward analysis. It seems that the compilers are acknowledging that there is a possibility for a translation based on the referential meaning. Still, the previously employed *sgra 'gyur*, which is based on a literal translation of the term, is not unfitting and can be fixed. In this case, the compilers used the second strategy, where a compound word is divided into its constituents, and each is given a paraphrase.

As for the exegesis of this epithet in the Pali commentarial literature, Buddhaghosa gives a lengthy gloss in his commentary on the *Dīgha-nikāya*. From his gloss, we learn that the fourfold explanation of the word *gata* is also held in common with the Southern scholarly tradition. In addition, Buddhaghosa adds several more meanings: "The Lord is [called] *tathāgata* because of eight reasons: he is a *tathāgata* because he came thus, he is a *tathāgata* because he went thus, he is a *tathāgata* because he came to such marks, he is a *tathāgata* because he realized the true condition of dhammas, he is a *tathāgata* because he teaches thus, he is a *tathāgata* because he explains thus, he is a *tathāgata* because he completed thus, he is a *tathāgata* because he mastered the goal."[22] Afterward, each of the eight reasons is given a long doctrinal explanation.

---

[22]   "Tathāgatassāti aṭṭhahi kāraṇehi bhagavā tathāgato. Tathā āgatoti tathāgato, tathā gatoti tathāgato, tathalakkhaṇaṃ āgatoti tathāgato, tathadhamme yāthāvato abhisambuddhoti tathāgato, tathadassitāya tathāgato, tathavāditāya tathāgato, tathākāritāya tathāgato, abhibhavanaṭṭhena tathāgatoti." (DA 59–60).

4. arhat

arhan zhes bya ba gcig tu na / *pūjām arhatīti arhan* zhes bya ste / lha dang mi la sogs pa kun gyi mchod par 'os pas na mchod 'os zhes kyang bya / yang gcig tu na / *kleśaarin hatavān arhan* zhes bya ste / nyon mongs pa'i dgra bcom pas na dgra bcom pa zhes kyang bya ste / rnam pa 'di gnyis las 'dir ni don btsan par bya ste dgra bcom pa zhes btags /

arhat – according to one [interpretation]: *pūjām arhatīti arhan*, [which means] deserving the veneration of gods, humans, and so on, therefore [the translation] is 'deserving veneration' (*mchod 'os*). It is also [explained] thus: *kleśārīn hatavān arhan*, [which means] one who destroyed the afflictions, the enemies, therefore enemy-destroyer (*dgra bcom pa*). Out of these two, the meaning which is to be enforced here is 'enemy-destroyer' (*dgra bcom pa*).

In this short entry, two different possibilities are presented. One is based on the linguistic etymology of the term *arhat*, while the other comes out of the hermeneutical etymology. The compilers decided to give precedence to the translation based on the doctrinal explanation. For the analysis of this term, the compilers used the most common strategy of providing a Sanskrit paraphrase. It seems that the hermeneutical etymology cited here is common to Buddhist scholasticism, as we find it in Dhammapāla's commentary to the *Petavatthu* as well: "'Arhats' exhausted bad influences. They destroyed the enemies-obscurations and the spokes of the wheel of *saṃsāra*, they keep away from them, they are deserving of the necessities [of monastic life], and they gave up evil actions. [Therefore] they are called arhats"[23] In this gloss, we can also find two kinds of doctrinal explanations. One is based on the hermeneutical etymology of the term: they destroyed (*hatattā*) the enemies-obscurations (*kilesārīnaṃ*), and one is derived from the linguistic meaning: they are deserving (*arahattā*) of the necessities [of monastic life] (*paccayādīnaṃ*).

---

[23]   "Arahantoti khīṇāsavā. Te hi kilesārīnaṃ saṃsāracakkassa arānañca hatattā, tato eva ārakattā, paccayādīnaṃ arahattā, pāpakaraṇe rahābhāvā ca 'arahanto'ti vuccanti." (PvA 7).

5. samyaksaṃbuddha

samyaksaṃbuddha zhes bya ba *samyak* ni yang dag pa / *sam* ni *samanta* 'am *sampūrṇṇa* ste ma lus pa 'am rdzogs pa / *buddha* ni sangs rgyas la bya ste / spyir na chos thams cad kyi ngo bo nyid ma nor bar thugs su chud cing mngon par byang chub pa'i mtshan te / yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas shes bya /

samyaksaṃbuddha – *samyak* [means] perfect, *sam* [is] *samanta* or *sampūrṇa*, [which means] complete or fulfilled. *Buddha* [means] awakened-expanded (*sangs rgyas*). In general, it is a name of the one who unerringly realized the nature of all *dharma*s and truly awakened. [The translation is fixed as] 'perfectly complete buddha' (*yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas*).

It seems that this entry did not pose any significant interpretational or doctrinal problems. The constituent elements of the compound term are separated in line with the second strategy described by Verhagen (1994, 22). To compare the analysis with the Pali commentarial tradition, the translation of the prefix *sam* presented in this entry is not reflected in Buddhaghosa's gloss of the term in the *Visuddhimagga*. There, he explains: "He perfectly and by himself understood all things, [therefore he is] a *samyaksaṃbuddha*".[24]

6. vidyācaraṇasaṃpanna

vidyācaraṇasaṃpanna zhes bya ba / *vidyā* ni rig pa / *caraṇa* ni rkang pa / *saṃpanna* ni ldan pa 'am phun sum tshogs pa la bya ste / bslab pa gsum dang sbyar na lhag pa'i shes rab ni rig pa / lhag pa'i sems dang lhag pa'i tshul khrims ni rkang pa / 'phags pa'i lam yan lag brgyad dang sbyar na / yang dag pa'i lta ba ni rig pa / lhag ma bdun ni rkang pa ste / rig pa mig dang 'dra bas mtshon nas rkang pas phyin cing thob par 'gyur bas na rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa zhes bya /

vidyācaraṇasaṃpanna – *vidyā* [means] knowledge, *caraṇa* [means] conduct,[25] *saṃpanna* [means] having or perfection. The special wisdom connected with the

---

[24] "Sammā sāmañca sabbadhammānaṃ buddhattā pana sammāsambuddho." (Vism VII 131).

[25] The basic meaning of both the Sanskrit *caraṇa* and the Tibetan *rkang pa* is 'leg' or 'foot'. However, the Sanskrit word can also refer moral or religious behavior or conduct (see Monier-Williams 1899, 389). The translation 'conduct' for the Tibetan *rkang pa* has been chosen because it fits into the context of the passage.

three trainings is the knowledge. The special mind and the special morality are the conduct. The perfect view connected with the eightfold noble path is the knowledge. The seven residues are the conduct. Comprehending with the knowledge as if with an eye and going with the conduct, attainment will come. Therefore [the translation is fixed as] 'on who has knowledge and conduct' (*rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa*).

While the first five entries dealt with epithets by which the Buddha is referred to, this one is closer to a description of his qualities. Similarly to the previous term, the strategy used in this analysis is to separate the compound into its constituents. However, instead of providing an etymology for the words, an explanation of their doctrinal connotations in the context of this term is given. The fixed translation is then a case of a straightforward convention-based translation.

7. sugata

sugata zhes bya ba gcig tu na / *śobhanaṅgata sugata surūpavat* ces bya ste / legs par gshegs pas na legs par gshegs pa ste / gzugs legs pa bzhin / *apunarāvṛtyagata sugata sunaṣṭajvaravat* ces bya ste / phyir mi ldog par gshegs pas na legs par gshegs pa ste / rims nad legs par byang ba bzhin / *yāvadgantabyagamanāt sugata* / *supūrṇa ghaṭavat* ces bya ste / ji tsam du 'gro bar bya ba ma lus par phyin pas na legs par gshegs pa ste / bum pa legs par gang ba bzhin no zhes 'byung / yang gcig tu na / *dharmmaskandha* las 'byung ba *sugata iti sukhito bhagavān svargita avyathita avyathitadharmmasamanvāgata / tad ucyate sugata* zhes 'byung ste / bcom ldan 'das bde bar gyur cing mtho ris kyi bde ba dang ldan la gnod pa mi mnga' zhing gnod pa med pa'i chos dang ldan pas na bde bar gshegs pa 'am bde bar brnyes pa la yang bya ste / 'dir sngar grags pa dang *dharmmaskandha* las 'byung ba dang sbyar te bde bar gshegs pa zhes btags /

sugata – according to one [interpretation]: *śobhanaṅgata sugata surūpavat*, [which means] one who came to goodness, therefore goodness-comer, like [in the case of the expression] good in form.[26] [A different explanation is] *apunarāvṛtyagata*

---

[26] Here, it is difficult to capture the intended meaning of the paraphrase. The Tibetans translated both the prefix *su* and the word *śobhana* as *legs pa*. The Sanskrit word *śobhana* can refer to physical beauty, which is also reflected in the provided explanatory word *surūpa* (good form, i.e. beautiful).

sugata sunaṣṭajvaravat, [which means] one who went without returning, therefore well-gone, like [in the case of the expression] a completely destroyed epidemic. [A different explanation is] *yāvadgantabyagamanāt sugata / supūrṇa ghaṭavat*, [which means] one who went completely as far as one can go, therefore well-gone, like [in the case of the expression] a completely filled pot. According to [a different interpretation,] originating from the *dharmaskandha*: *sugata iti sukhito bhagavān svargita avyathita avyathitadharmmasamanvāgata / tad ucyate sugata*, [which means] the Lord reached happiness but does not experience the harm associated with the happines of the heavenly realms, he has qualities bereft of harm, therefore 'one who came to happiness' (*bde bar gshegs pa*) or also 'one who found happiness' (*bde bar brnyes pa*). Here, [the translation,] which is already popular and stems from the *dharmaskandha* is fixed: 'one who came to happiness' (*bde bar gshegs pa*).

The compound term *sugata* is here analyzed according to different possible interpretations. For the first three, an additional compound is provided, which illustrates the same type of internal grammar. In the end, similarly to the case of *tathāgata*, the compilers decided to fix a term that had already been in use and was based on a scriptural source. The explanations provided first, which translate the term as *legs par gshegs pa*, are cases of convention-based translation, or *sgra 'gyur*, because they preserve the ambiguity of the prefix *su-*. The fixed translation of *sugata* can be understood as a reference-based translation because it interprets the prefix *su-* as referring to transcendent happiness.

Buddhaghosa provides this gloss: "He went well, he went to a beautiful place, he went perfectly, he speaks perfectly, therefore [he is] a *sugata*."[27] As we can see, the explanation is similar to the one provided in the above analysis.

8. lokavid

lokavid ces bya ba *loka* ni 'jig rten / *vid* ni *vida jñāne* ste de bzhin gshegs pas nyin lan gsum mtshan lan gsum du 'dul ba'i sems can gyi khams la gzigs shing / skal ba yod pa dang med pa rtogs par mkhyen pas na 'jig rten mkhyen pa zhes bya /

---

[27]   "Sobhanagamanattā, sundaraṃ ṭhānaṃ gatattā, sammā gatattā, sammā ca gadattā sugato." (Vism VII 134).

lokavid – *loka* [means] world, [the verbal root] *vid* [is explained as] *vida jñāne*, [which means knowledge]. Tathāgatas look three times during the day and three times during the night over the realm of beings to be tamed and understand or know who is fortunate and who is unfortunate. Therefore [the translation is fixed as] 'knower of the world' (*'jig rten mkhyen pa*).

In this analysis, a *dhātupāṭha* entry is cited for the first time in order to clarify the meaning of the verbal root *vid*. This entry is a clear case of convention-based translation established on a morphological-historical etymology. To clarify the meaning, a doctrinal explanation is provided, which references a quality of the Buddha also found in narrative literature such as the *Avadānaśataka* (see, for example, Speyer 1909, 48). This notion is not found in Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhimagga*, where the term is explained as referring to the fact that the Buddha knows all there is to know about the world and its inhabitants (Vism VII 135–137).

9. anuttarapuruṣadamyasārathi

anuttarapuruṣadamyasārathi zhes bya ba / *anuttara* ni bla na med pa / *puruṣadamyasārathi* ni skyes bu 'dul ba'i kha lo sgyur ba ste / sor mo'i phreng ba la sogs pa zhe sdang che ba dang / dga' bo la sogs pa 'dod chags che ba dang / lteng rgyas 'od srung la sogs pa gti mug che ba'i 'dul ba'i sems can rta rgod dang 'dra ba 'dul dka' ba rnams 'jam pos 'dul ba yang 'jam pos btul / drag pos 'dul ba yang drag pos btul / gnyi gas 'dul ba yang gnyi gas btul te / thabs bzang zhing sla bas thabs bzhin du btul nas don du bsgrub pa'i mchog mya ngan las 'das pa la gnas par kha lo sgyur zhing 'jog pas na / skyes bu 'dul ba'i kha lo sgyur ba bla na med pa zhes bya /

anuttarapuruṣadamyasārathi – *anuttara* [means] unsurpassed, *puruṣadamyasārathi* [means] acting as a charioteer for beings to be tamed. He gently tames and gently trains beings to be tamed who are hard to tame, like a wild horse, such as those [afflicted by] strong hatred like Aṅgulimāla etc., [afflicted by] strong desire like Nanda etc., [afflicted by] strong ignorance like Uruvilva Kāśyapa. He tames fiercely and trains fiercely. He tames in both [manners] and he trains in both [manners]. He trains in a fitting way with a good and easy method to establish [beings] in the

perfect nirvāṇa. He acts and places himself as a charioteer. Therefore [the translation is fixed as] 'the unsurpassed charioteer of the beings to be tamed (*skyes bu 'dul ba'i kha lo sgyur ba bla na med pa*).

The meaning of the constituents of this composite term does not pose any significant problems. Therefore, the majority of the analysis is taken up by an explanation of the ways in which the Buddha leads beings and establishes them on the path towards liberation. As an illustration, reference is also made to the well-known disciples of the Buddha.

10. śāstṛ

śāsta zhes bya ba *śāsu anuśiṣṭau* zhes bya ste / spyir tshig gi don du na ston zhing slob pa la bya / *ta* ni tshig gi rkyen du bya bar zad de / spyir na lha dang mi la sogs pa thams cad kyi ston par gyur pas na ston pa zhes bya /

śāstṛ – [the verbal root *śās* is explained as] *śāsu anuśiṣṭau*, [which means teaching]. The regular meaning of the word is teacher or instructor. [The suffix] *ta* is only a noun [forming] suffix. In general, [the Buddha] acts as the teacher of all gods, men etc. Therefore, [the translation is fixed as] 'teacher' (*ston pa*).

11. jina

jina zhes bya ba *jitapāpakākuśaladharmma* zhes bya ste / sdig pa dang mi dge ba'i chos las rgyal bas na rgyal ba zhes bya /

jina – [is explained as] *jitapāpakākuśaladharmma*, [which means] he who has won over evil and unvirtuous things. Therefore [the translation is fixed as] 'victor' (*rgyal ba*).

Because of their simplicity, the above two entries will be commented on together. In both, the compilers used morphological etymology to arrive at a convention-based translation. The analysis of the term *śāstṛ* also provides a grammatical explanation, citing a *dhātupāṭha* gloss and giving a morphological explanation of the suffix *-ta* (in the neutral form *-tṛ*). Although it is not explicitly stated, the inclusion of the simple terms *śāstṛ* and *jina* could be taken as resolving the

issue of whether special terminology is needed when these are applied to the Buddha or an exalted being, like in the case of *bhagavat* and *arhat*. The explanations showed that there is no special hermeneutical etymology which would provide a doctrinal justification for separate translations. Thus, the simple Tibetan equivalents '*teacher*' (*ston pa*) and '*victor*' (*rgyal ba*) were fixed. In Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhimagga*, we do find a hermeneutical etymology. However, it is based on a similarity in Pāli, which is not applicable to Sanskrit. That is, the Pali word *satthar* (teacher, Sanskrit *śāstṛ*) is connected with the word *satthavāha* (a caravan leader, Sanskrit *sārthavāha*) (Vism VII 140).

With the tenth entry, the compilers also finished the standard enumeration of Buddha's qualities, and four more epithets, which are found elsewhere, are covered.

12. tāyin

tāyi zhes bya ba *tāyi* ni *santānapālanayoḥ* zhes bya ste / 'phags pa'i lam thugs su chud pa bstan cing bshad de / rgyun mi gcod pa dang / skyob cing skyong ba la bya ste / *pāla* skyong ba zhes btags pa zhig kyang gud na yod pa dang ma 'dom par bya ste skyob par btags /

tāyin – *tāyi* [is explained as] *santānapālanayoḥ*, [which means protecting the family]. Having realized the path of nobles, he teaches and explains. [The Buddha] continuously protects and guards. [The Sanskrit word] *pāla* is fixed as 'guard' (*skyong*). [Therefore,] in order to have a distinction and not conflate [these two terms], [the translation] is fixed as 'protector' (*skyob*).

The last three epithets of the Buddha are not widely used. In this entry, the term is explained by a paraphrase, and its doctrinal connotations are presented. The explanation uses the Tibetan word *skyong* (guard), which has already been fixed for a different term. Therefore, a synonymous translation is fixed.

13. mahāṛṣi

mahāṛṣi zhes bya ba *mahā* ni chen po / *ṛṣi* ni *ṛṣi gatau* zhes bya ste / shes pa dang ldan pa la 'ang bya / yang gcig tu na / *ṛdhyati praṇidhānan* zhes bya ste / smon pa rnams 'byor zhing 'grub pa la 'ang bya / yang gcig tu na / *kāyavāgmanobhi ṛju śete iti ṛṣi* zhes bya ste / lus dang ngag dang yid drang por gnas shing srong bas na drang srong chen po zhes btags /

mahāṛṣi – *mahā* [means] great. [The word] *ṛṣi* is [explained as] *ṛṣi gatau*, [which means movement]. It also [refers to] the possessor of knowledge. It is also [explained] thus: *ṛdhyati praṇidhānan*, [which means] he receives and fulfills prayers. It is also [explained] thus: *kāyavāgmanobhi ṛju śete iti*, [which means] he rests with his body, speech, and mind erect and straightened. Therefore [the term] is fixed as 'great straightener' (*drang srong chen po*).

In this entry, the compilers are analysing the word ṛṣi, which also refers to the originators of the Vedas and Vedic ascetics. Three different explanations are presented, the first one of which is a *dhātupāṭha* citation. In the end, the compilers gave precedence to the hermeneutical etymology, which is perhaps most specific to the Buddhist use of the term. From it, a reference-based translation is fixed.

14. āṃgirasa

āṃgirasa zhes bya ba thog ma drang srong nyid kyi lus las byung bas na bdag lus skyes shes bshad pa dang / *āṃgirasa* ni nyi ma ste / nyi ma'i rigs yin pas na nyi ma'i rgyud ces kyang bshad du rung bar 'dul ba'i dngos po dang bshad pa las 'byung la / mdo sde dag las sku'i kha dog nyi ma bzhin du lham me lhang nger bzhugs pa'i yon tan lta bur yang bshad pas nyi ma'i rgyud ces btags /

āṃgirasa – The first ṛṣi originated from himself, therefore it is explained as 'born [from] his own body'. [The word] *āṃgirasa* [refers to] the sun. [The Buddha] is from the solar dynasty, therefore it is also possible to explain it as 'descended from the sun'. According to the explanation in the Vinayavastu, in the sūtras it is explained as the quality that [the Buddha's] body is like the sun in color, luminous

and brilliant. Therefore [the term] is fixed as 'descended from the sun' (*nyi ma'i rgyud*).

The last term included in the first thematic area is *āṃgirasa*. As opposed to the other terms, this one is based not on a general word but on a clan name. The term is analyzed through hermeneutical etymology, linking the sun and the solar dynasty. In this way, the term has strong Brahminical connotations.

6. Conclusion

In this thesis, the royal translation project during the early period of the transmission of Buddhism to Tibet has been presented. It has been shown that the translation process was strictly regulated by a council created by the emperor Khri Srong lde btsan. This council put together guidelines that translators were supposed to follow and codified Sanskrit-Tibetan terminological equivalents. This standardization was applied only to translations made from Sanskrit, and alternative Chinese-Tibetan vocabulary was in use at the same time. However, as Chinese sources fell into disfavor, which is evidenced by the diminishing number of reported translations from this language in the imperially sponsored catalogues, the standardized Indo-Tibetan vocabulary became the only norm. A royally initiated revision enforced the unification of terminology in all available translations. From the overview presented above, we can also conclude that the emperor Khri lDe srong btsan was unduly overlooked in later Tibetan historiographical literature, as the important orthographical-terminological reform, as well as most significant progress in the translation process, were likely done during his reign.

The terminological norms were collected in the so-called *vyutpatti*-treatises. Most terms which did not need an explanation for their translation, were collected in the Sanskrit-Tibetan dictionary *Mahāvyutpatti*. On the other hand, over four hundred terms for which an explanation was required were collected in the Sanskrit-Tibetan glossary *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, which was the main topic of this thesis. The first thematic area, the epithets of the Buddha, was translated, and the explanatory strategies of the compilers were commented upon. It was shown that the compilers sensibly combined morphological-historical and hermeneutical etymology, firmly basing themselves in the Indian exegetical and grammatical tradition, to arrive at a doctrinally most satisfying Tibetan translation. By providing examples from the Pāli commentarial tradition for some of the terms, it has been shown that the compilers were drawing on a shared Buddhist exegetical heritage, at least in the case of the epithets of the Buddha. However, not all included terms required an elaborate justification for their translation. Instead, a doctrinal explanation was provided, which clarified the correct connotations of the term. As such, the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* is an invaluable resource for information on Buddhist hermeneutical and grammatical exegesis. It can also be helpful in the translation of Buddhist texts from Tibetan, as it provides

authoritative clarifications of core Buddhist terminology. This makes it valuable for arriving at doctrinally correct equivalents in English or other languages.

7. Bibliography

Pāli works cited

DA *Dīghanikāya-aṭṭhakathā*, *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*. Edition by Pali Text Society

Nd1 *Mahāniddesa*. Edition by Pali Text Society

PvA *Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā*. Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana Edition. Available from https://tipitaka.org/.

Vism *Visuddhimagga*. Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana Edition. Available from https://tipitaka.org/.

General bibliography

Beckwith, C. I. 1983. "The Revolt of 755 in Tibet." In *Contributions on Tibetan Language, History and Culture, Vol. 1*, edited by Ernst Steinkellner and Helmut Tauscher, First Indi, 1–16. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Biondo, Serena. 2021. "Narrative Sources of the Great Debate." In *Bringing Buddhism to Tibet: History and Narrative in the Dba' Bzhed Manuscript*, edited by Lewis Doney, 75–87. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Braarvig, Jens. 2018. "The Imprint of Buddhist Sanskrit on Chinese and Tibetan: Some Lexical Ontologies and Translation Strategies in the Tang Dynasty." In *Studies in Multilingualism, Lingua Franca and Lingua Sacra*, edited by Jens Braarvig and Markham J. Geller, 427–51. Edition Open Access Max Planck Institute for the History of Science.

Bu ston. 1990. *Bu Ston's History of Buddhism in Tibet. Critical Edition with a Comprehensive Index by J. Szerb*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Doney, Lewis. 2017. "Narrative Transformations: The Spiritual Friends of Khri Srong Lde Brtsan." In *Interaction in the Himalayas and Central Asia: Process of Transfer, Translation and Transformation in Art, Archaeology, Religion and Polity*, edited by Eva Allinger, Franitz Grenet, Christian Jahoda, Maria-Katharina Lang, and Anne Vergati, 311–20. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

———. 2021. "The Testimony of Ba: Literature and Exemplars." In *Bringing Buddhism to Tibet: History and Narrative in the Dba' Bzhed Manuscript*, edited by Lewis Doney, 3–23. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Dotson, Brandon. 2007. "'Emperor' Mu Rug Btsan and the 'Phang Thang Ma Catalogue."

Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies 3: 1–25.

———. 2013. "Tibetan Law: Trial for Homicide." In *Sources of the Tibetan Tradition*, edited by Kurtis R. Schaeffer, Matthew T. Kapstein, and Gray Tuttle, 87–88. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. 2015. "The Remains of Dharma: Editing, Rejecting, and Replacing the Buddha's Words in Officially Commisioned Sūtras from Dunhuang, 820s to 840s." *Journal of the Internation Association of Buddhist Studies* 36/37: 5–68.

———. 2017. "Tri Songdétsen." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.013.201.

Dung dkar Blo bzang 'Phrin las. 2002. *Dung dkar tshig mdzod chen mo*. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang.

Hahn, Michael. 2010. "Striving for Perfection: On the Various Ways of Translating Sanskrit into Tibetan." *Pacific World: Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies* 9: 123–49.

Halkias, Georgios T. 2004. "Tibetan Buddhism Registered: A Catalogue from the Imperial Court of 'Phang Thang." *The Eastern Buddhist* 36 (1/2): 46–105.

———. 2014. "Translating the Foreign into the Local: The Cultural Production and Canonization of Buddhist Texts in Imperial Tibet." In *Translation and Global Asia: Relocating Networks of Cultural Production*, edited by Uganda Kwan Sze-pui and Lawrence Wang-chi Wong, 143–66. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

———. 2017. "The Mirror and the Palimpsest: The Myth of Buddhist Kingship in Imperial Tibet." In *Locating Religions: Contact, Diversity and Translocality*, edited by Reinhold F. Glei and Nikolas Jaspert, 123–50. Leiden: Brill.

Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid. 2002. "The Lhan Kar Ma as a Source for the History of Tantric Buddhism." In *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism*, edited by Helmut Eimer and David Germano, 129–50. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2008. *Die Lhan Kar Ma: Ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische Übersetzten Buddhistischen Texte*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. 1997. "On the Sources of Some Entries in the Mahavyutpatti: Contributions to Indo-Tibetan Lexicography 1." In *Untersuchungen zur Buddhistischen Literatur, Zweite Folge: Gustav Roth zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*, edited by Heinz Bechert, Sven Bretfeld, and Petra Kieffer-Pülz, 183–99. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Ishikawa, Mie. 1990. *A Critical Edition of the sGra sbyor bam po gnyis-pa: An Old and Basic Commentary on the Mahāvyutpatti*. The Toyo B. Tokyo.

Jamgön Kongtrul. 2010. *The Treasury of Knowledge Books Two, Three, and Four: Buddhism's Journey to Tibet*. Translated by Ngawang Zangpo. Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications.

Kapstein, Matthew T. 2000. *The Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism: Conversion, Contestaion, and Memory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Khangkar, Tsultrim Kalsang. 1993. "The Assassinations of Tri Ralpachen and Lang Darma." *The*

Tibet Journal 18 (2): 17–22.

Kollmar-Paulenz. 2007. "The Buddhist Way into Tibet." In *The Spread of Buddhism*, edited by Ann Heirman and Stephan Peter Bumbacher, 303–40. Leiden: Brill.

Li, Channa. 2016. "Translationship Lost in Transmission: Elusive Attributions of Two Tibetan Sūtra Translations." *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 37: 207–30.

Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Corrected Edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Pagel, Ulrich. 2007. "The Dhāraṇīs of Mahāvyutpatti #748: Origin and Formation." *Buddhist Studies Review* 24 (2): 151–91.

Panglung, Jampa L. 1994. "New Fragments of the sGra-sbyor bam-po gñis-pa." *East and West* 44 (1): 161–72.

rTa rdo, ed. 2003. *dKar chag 'phang Thang Ma / sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1973. "On Translating the Buddhist Canon." In *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture, Volume 5*, edited by Perala Ratnam, 243–61. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.

———. 1998. "Sanskrit-Tibetan and Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionaries and Some Problems in Indo-Tibetan Philosophical Lexicography." In *Lexicography in the Indian and Buddhist Cultural Fields*, edited by Boris Oguibénine, 115–42. München: Kommission für Zentralasiatische Studien, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Sárközi, Alice. 1980. "Some Words on the Mongolian Mahāvyutpatti." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 34 (1/3): 219–34.

Schaeffer, Kurtis R., Matthew T. Kapstein, and Gray Tuttle, eds. 2013. *Sources of the Tibetan Tradition*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina. 1999. "Translation, Transmission, Tradition: Suggestions from Ninth-Century Tibet." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 27 (1/2): 67–77.

———. 2002. "Enacting Words: A Diplomatic Analysis of the Imperial Decrees (Bkas Bcad) and Their Application in the Sgra Sbyor Bam Po Gñis Pa Tradition." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 25 (1–2): 263–340.

Speyer, J. F. 1909. *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna, Vol. 2*. St. Pétersbourg: Académie impériale des sciences.

Stein, Rolf. 2010. *Rolf Stein's Tibetica Antiqua*. Edited and translated by Arthur P. McKeown. Leiden: Brill.

Uray, Géza. 1955. "On the Tibetan Letters Ba and Wa: Contribution to the Origin and History of the Tibetan Alphabet." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 5: 101–21.

———. 1989. "Contributions to the Date of the Vyutpatti-Treatises." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 43 (1): 3–21.

Verhagen, Peter. 1988. "Tibetan Expertise in Sanskrit Grammar – A Case-Study: Grammatical Analysis of the Term Pratītya-Samutpāda." *Journal of the Tibet Society* 8: 21–48.

———. 1994. *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet, Volume One: Transmission of the Canonical Literature*. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2001. "Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (1): Issues of Interpretation and Translation in the Minor Works of Si-tu Paṇ-chen Chos-kyi-'byuṅ-gnas (1699?-1774)." *Journal of the Internation Association of Buddhist Studies* 24 (1): 61–88.

———. 2015. "'Tools of the Trade' of the Tibetan Translators." In *Tibetan Literary Genres, Texts, and Text Types*, edited by Jim Rheingans, 182–96. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2017. "Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (7): Sa skya Paṇḍita's Mkhas 'jug on the Sanskrit-Tibetan Interface: Synthesis, Comparison and Translation." *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 42: 246–67.

Walter, Michael L. 2009. *Buddhism and Empire: The Political and Religious Culture of Early Tibet*. Leiden: Brill.

Wangchuk, Dorji. 2020. "The Three Royal Decrees (Bka' Bcad Gsum) in the History of Tibetan Buddhism." In *Archaeologies of the Written: Indian, Tibetan, and Buddhist Studies in Honour of Cristina Scherrer-Schaub*, edited by Vincent Tournier, Vincent Eltschinger, and Marta Sernesi, 943–75. Naples: Dipartimento Asia, Africa e Mediterraneo Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale," UniorPress.

Yamaguchi, Zuihō. 1996. "The Fiction of King Dar-Ma's Persecution of Buddhism." In *Du Dunhuang au Japon: Études Chinoises et Bouddhiques offertes à Michel Soymié*, edited by Jean-Pierre Drège, 231–58. Geneva: Droz.