

XII. The Chapter on *bdag*, *gzhan*, and *bya byed las gsum* from the Commentary of gSer tog Blo bzang tshul khrims rgya mtsho on the *Sum cu pa* and *rTags kyi 'jug pa*

§1. [137] With regard to the fourth [heading], i.e., “for what purpose are the [prefixes] applied?”, there are the following two [subheadings]: 1. a brief explanation of actions (*bya* = *bya ba*, *kriyā*), agents (*byed* = *byed pa po*, *kartr*) and objects (*las*, *karman*). 2. the actual explanation as to how the [prefixes] are applied.

§2. [138] 1. Since those who do not direct their minds properly to the meaning of [terms] such as “actions,” “agents,” “objects,” “self” (*bdag*), “other” (*gzhan*), “past” (*'das*), “future” (*ma 'ongs*), [and] “present” (*da lta ba*) do not understand the meaning of the *rTags kyi 'jug pa* conclusively, let me therefore explain a bit [what these terms mean]. While there are a few differences in the division of actions, agents, and objects according to whether the [verb] is or is not in relation with a distinct agent, nonetheless, to take the main points, the performance (*bgyi ba*) by an agent of that act (*las su bya ba*)¹ which is to be performed is termed “action,” the principal agent (*byed pa po gtso bo*) and secondary agent (*byed pa phal ba*) of that action are both termed “agents (*byed pa* = *byed pa po*),” and the object which is a focus of the action (*bya ba 'i yul*) is termed “object” (*las*).

§3. Let's explain these [notions] on the basis of some examples. When one says

¹ I take *las su bya ba* here in the sense of “act” and not in its well-known technical sense where it means the second Sanskrit case, i.e., accusative, and especially the use of the Tibetan particle *la* in the accusative. Note that *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo s.v. las su bya ba* gives *bya ba byed pa*—which can be “thing-done and doing” (cf. n. 3 on Bra ti dge bshes) or simply “doing an action”—as the first sense. The technical sense is presented as the second explanation in that dictionary.

“For the sake of getting rich, wealth is/will be sought after with diligence by paupers,”

getting rich is a focus of the action, the pauper is the principal agent, diligence is the secondary agent, wealth is the actual object and “... being sought after” is the actual action.

§4. When one says

“For the sake of initiation, the hands hold a vase,”

initiation is a focus of the action, the hands are the agent, the vase is the object, and holding is the action.

§5. When one says

“For ablution, a vase is to be held,”

ablution is a focus of the action, vase is the object, being held is the action. The agent has to be indirectly understood (*shugs las rtogs pa*).

§6. When one says

“He holds a vase,”

the vase is the object, holding is the action. By saying *byed* [in *'dzin par byed*] one indicates the agent [i.e., “he”].

§7. As for the meaning of the twofold division into self and other, in this context when we speak of “self” and “other,” we should not understand simply the self and other as when we generally [i.e., ordinarily] differentiate [one] self and other [people]. Rather, the agent (*byed pa po*) and instrument (*byed pa*)² of an act and the act-qua-doing (*byed pa'i las*) are said to be self, while the focus of the action (*bya ba'i yul*), the [undergone] action [i.e., “thing-done”] (*bya ba*), and the act-qua-thing-done (*bya ba'i las*) are said to be other.³

² Here *byed pa* has to be taken in its sense of “the instrument” (= *karāṇa*). See AACT p. 6 and pp. 101-102, s.v. *byed pa*.

³ Cf. Si tu p. 193: *pho ni 'das dang gzhan bsgrub phyir // zhes sogs kyi go don dpyis phyin par byed pa la / thog mar 'di shes dgos te / las gang zhig byed pa po gzhan dang dngos su 'brel ba'i dbang du byas nas / byed pa po'i dngos po de nyid dang de'i byed pa dang*

§8. [139] Now, when a pauper diligently seeks wealth, then in terms of the two [aspects] that pertain to the act [of wealth-seeking] in question at that time—i.e., the act that is to be done (*bya rgyu'i las*) and the act that one is now doing (*byed bzhin pa'i las*)—the act of seeking the wealth now (*nor 'tshol bzhin pa'i las*) is [classifiable as] the act that he [i.e., the pauper] is doing now (*byed bzhin pa'i las*). Thus, in terms of self and other it is [classified under] the entity self (*dnegos po bdag*), and it is termed “the act that pertains to the agent” (*byed pa po la yod pa'i las*), “the present act” (*da lta ba'i las*), and “the act of seeking” (*'tshol bar byed pa'i las*). But seeking and then finding the wealth is the act that is to be done (*bya rgyu'i las*), and thus in terms of self and other it is [classified under] the entity other (*dnegos po gzhan*), and it is termed “the act that pertains to the focus of the action” (*bya ba yul la yod pa'i las*), “the future act that is to

bcas pa la ni bdag ces bya zhing / des bsgrub par bya ba'i yul gyi dnegos po bya ba dang bcas pa la ni gzhan zhes bya'o //. “The masculine [prefix *b-*] is for establishing the past and other.’ To achieve a thorough understanding of the sense of this and the rest [of śloka twelve in the *rTags gyi 'jug pa*], one must first be aware of the following: Given some act directly related with a distinct agent (*byed pa po gzhan*), then that very entity (*dnegos po*) which is the agent and its ‘doing’ (*de'i byed pa*) are termed ‘self.’ The entity which is the focus (*yul*) to be established by that [agent] as well as that thing which is to be done (*bya ba*) are termed ‘other.’” See Tillemans 1988, 491 *et seq.*; AACT 4-8, 62-63. For the two senses of *bya ba*, i.e., action taken in a general sense and the “patient-prominent” sense of “thing-done,” see AACT 71, n. 2. In the latter sense it is contrasted with *byed pa* (“doing”) and becomes a particular type of action. Cf. Bra ti dge bshes *rTags kyi 'jug pa'i dngongs 'grel*, p. 162: *las ni bya ba byed pa gnyis /*. “The act is of two sorts: thing-done and doing.” Finally, note that the term *bya ba'i yul* is also used differently on occasion by indigenous grammarians. In the preceding and subsequent paragraphs, *gSer tog* uses the term *bya ba'i yul* (“focus of the action”) in two ways: 1. in the sense of object (*las = karman*) or patient of the action, expressed by an accusative case. 2. as the goal of the action, expressed by a dative. The first sense is what figures in the traditional definition of self and other and is no doubt the main use in most traditional exegeses of śloka twelve, including that of *gSer tog sum rtags* (see §§2, 9, 10, 11, 22). The second sense, however, is what we see used in *gSer tog*’s paragraphs §§3-5. A few other grammarians (e.g., sKal bzang ‘gyur med and dKar lebs drung yig Pad ma rdo rje) saw *bya ba'i yul* as involving a *la* particle (whereas *las* would not): they maintained that *bya ba'i yul* could be (or had to be) a locative, the place of the action. See chapter XI on the triple ambiguity of *bya ba'i yul* in *Sum rtags* literature; for an attempt to understand the diverse sorts of *las* and *bya ba'i yul*, see also Zeisler 2006.

be done” (*bya ‘gyur ma ‘ongs pa’i las*), and “the act pertaining to what is being sought after” (*btsal bya’i las*). Therefore, we should understand that the act pertaining to the agent and the act pertaining to the focus of the action, respectively, acquire the sense of self and other.⁴

§9. If we condense these [above-mentioned] points, they are [all] subsumed under two [categories, viz.,] “entities” (*dngos po*) and “acts” (*las*). In “entities” there is the entity self, the entity other, and the entity that is the object (*las kyi dngos po*). We say that the pauper and his diligence are, in terms of self and others, the entity self, and in terms of the triad, action, agents, and objects, they are said to be agents (*byed pa = byed pa po*). We say that the wealth that is sought after (*btsal bya’i nor*) is, in terms of self and other, the entity other in that it is a focus of the action to be accomplished; we say that it is the entity that is the object (*las kyi dngos po*), in terms of the triad, action, agents, and objects. As for the action of wealth being sought (*nor btsal ba’i bya ba*), in terms of self and other, it can be said to be an entity other in that it is the entity that is the thing-done (*bya ba’i dngos po*).⁵

§10. As for acts (*las*), there are two sorts: act-qua-doing (*byed pa’i las*) and act-qua-thing-done (*bya ba’i las*). The pauper’s seeking wealth diligently is said to be the act-qua-doing (*byed pa’i las*) in that it is the act related to the agent, the pauper (*byed pa po dbul po dang ‘brel ba’i las*). The action of seeking wealth with diligence is said to be the act related to the agent (*byed pa po dang ‘brel ba’i las*) and the act related to self (*bdag dang ‘brel ba’i las*), because, being related to the diligence, it is of the same nature (*ngo bo gcig*) as it. The fact of wealth being sought after and then found (*nor btsal nas rnyed pa’i cha*) is said to be the act-qua-thing-

⁴ See AACT 21-22.

⁵ A kya Yongs ‘dzin does not recognize the patient-prominent action as *dngos po gzhan*. Si tu does not explicitly do so, either (AACT p. 62-63). They classify it as just *gzhan* (“other”). See AACT p. 6 *et seq.*, n. 11. However, see chapter XI for an in-depth discussion of Tibetan grammarians’ diverging uses of the term *dngos po* and the consequent difficulty of finding convincing Indic antecedents for this term in Vyākaraṇa literature. Our discussion in chapter XI is based on the four diverging positions that the nineteenth century grammarian dKar lebs drung yig Pad ma rdo rje describes. dKar lebs drung yig Pad ma rdo rje adds his own position, too. His own view and gSer tog’s view are significantly different from the four. One should not underestimate the divergences amongst grammarians on the interpretation of *dngos po*.

done (*bya ba'i las*) and the act related to the other (*gzhan dang 'brel ba'i las*), because it is the act related to the focus of the action, i.e., wealth.⁶

§11. [140] Action (*bya ba*) is also of two [sorts]. The effort [involved] in wealth being sought after with diligence (*nor 'bad pas btsal ba'i rtsol ba*) is termed the action pertaining to the agent (*byed pa po la yod pa'i bya ba*) in that it pertains to the agent, the pauper. [Wealth] having been sought after and found (*btsald zin rnyed pa*) pertains to the focus of the action, the wealth, and is thus said to be the action that pertains to the focus of the action (*bya ba yul la yod pa'i bya ba*).⁷

§12. As for the meaning of the divisions into the three times (*dus gsum*), the act of wealth being sought after (*nor btsal bya'i las*) is something that will be done (*bya 'gyur*) while a [future] act of seeking (*'tshol ba'i las*)⁸ is something that [the agent] will do (*byed 'gyur*). Thus they are [classified as] future. The act of now seeking wealth (*nor 'tshol bzhin pa'i las*) is what [the agent] is doing now and is hence present. When one becomes rich after having sought [wealth] (*btsald zin phyug por song ba*), the action has been already done and is thus termed past. “Seek wealth!” (*nor tshold cig ces pa*) is an imperative (*bskul tshig*) included in act-qua-doing (*byed las su gtogs pa*) and is thus said to be future.⁹

⁶ AACT pp. 7-8. *Ibid.* p. 40 §7 for A kya Yongs 'dzin's explanation. Müller-Witte 2009, 207-209 sees gSer tog's formulation of *bya ba'i las* in terms of a result like “finding” as an anticipation of the causative-resulative (*Kausativ-resultativ*) distinction developed by contemporary grammarians like dPa' ris sang rgyas—it can be seen as going in the direction of a type of *Zustandspassiv*, emphasizing a result like being found, rather than a *Vorgangspassiv*, emphasizing the seeking process that is undergone.

⁷ The translation is deliberately passive in keeping with gSer tog's view that *btsald* (past of *'tshol*) would show act-qua-thing-done (*bya ba'i las*) and, thus, an act related to the other. See also below §20. Note that A kya Yongs 'dzin also takes the past as showing *bya ba'i las*. See AACT p. 42, §9. Not all grammarians do—Si tu takes the past as showing neither self nor other. For the differences between Si tu, gSer tog, and A kya Yongs 'dzin on the question of the past, see Tillemans 1988, 501; see also Herforth's discussion in AACT, 83 *et seq.*

⁸ *'tshol ba* is the present simplex form, but what is meant here is the periphrastic “future act-qua-doing” (*byed 'gyur ma 'ongs pa*) construction, viz., *'tshol bar 'gyur*, where the present simplex form is linked with the auxiliary *'gyur*.

⁹ (a) The term *byed las* has two important uses in this text: the ordinary sense of “function,” “action,” “work,” and the specialized sense of “act-qua-doing.” For the ordinary sense see M. Goldstein *Tibetan-English Dictionary of Modern Tibetan*, Kathmandu,

§13. However, there is some difference between the way to classify the three times in terms of [the triad] actions, agents, and objects (*bya byed las kyi dus gsum*) and the way to classify the three times generally (*spyir dus gsum gyi 'jog tshul*). Take, for example, something like

gdul bya 'i sems can (“the sentient being to be disciplined”).

There are three applications for the word *las* (“object”/“patient”):¹⁰ *gdul bya* (“that which is to be disciplined”), i.e., the actual, future word for the object (*las sgra dngos ma 'ongs pa*), or *sems can* (“sentient being”) are termed the object (*las*); *'dul ba* (“... disciplines/...is disciplining”) is termed present doing (*byed pa da lta ba*); *btuld pa* (“... has been disciplined”) is termed the past that has been done (*byas zin 'das pa*); *gdul bar bya* (“... is to be disciplined”) is termed the future act-qua-thing-done (*bya ba 'i las ma 'ongs pa*). One should understand the following points: when we again have to discipline (*slar 'dul dgos pa*) the sentient being by means

1978, s.v. *byed las*. *Dag yig gсар bsgrigs* p. 537 gives: *byed las ni rgyu rkyen zhig gis dngos su bskyed pa 'i 'bras bu'am nus pa 'i ming ste / sman gyi byed las / nad kyi byed las zhes pa lta bu /*. “*byed las* is the name for the effect that is directly produced by a cause or condition, or [the name] for the capability. For example, the action of the medicine, the action of the sickness.” See §19 for this use in gSer tog.

(b) In the phrase *byed las su gtogs pa* in §12, however, *byed las* is best taken in the specialized sense of *byed pa 'i las*, rather than its ordinary sense. If we take it that way, we find that gSer tog’s characterization of the imperative is saying the same thing as that of A kya Yongs ‘dzin, who speaks of the imperative as *byed pa 'i las su gtogs pa* “included in act-qua-doing.” Note that the imperative is quite controversial—some grammarians argue that it should be neither act-qua-doing nor act-qua-thing-done (AACT p. 21). A kya Yongs ‘dzin, however, does take it as showing act-qua-doing (*byed pa 'i las*) (AACT p. 54, §22): *da lta ba dang bskul tshig gnyis byed pa 'i las su gtogs la /*. “The present and imperative are both included in act-qua-doing.”

(c) Although grammarians usually say that there is a link between *bya ba 'i las* and the future, there are periphrastic futures—like *gcod par 'gyur* “he will cut”—which do *not* show *bya ba 'i las*, but rather *byed pa 'i las*. See chapter X. It seems that, if we are to believe gSer tog, the imperatives also show both future and *byed pa 'i las*.

¹⁰ This triple application for the word *las* is found elsewhere, too, e.g., in A kya Yongs ‘dzin’s *rNam dbye brgyad dang bya byed las sogs kyi khyad par mdo tsam brjod pa dka 'i gnas gsal ba 'i me long*, p. 452. For the details, see chapter X, n. 6. The three are: the object, the act-qua-doing, and the act-qua-thing-done.

of a disciplinary action (*gdul ba'i bya ba*), this [use of 'dul] is temporally future (*dus kyi dus ma 'ongs pa*); 'dul *bzhin pa* ("is now disciplining") is temporally present (*dus kyi dus da lta ba*); *btuld zin pa* ("... has been disciplined") is temporally past (*dus kyi dus 'das pa*).¹¹

§14. In this context, the meaning of "being related to a distinct agent" (*byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel*) or "not being so related" is as follows. When a distinct agent directly establishes an object and action (*bya ba*), this is said to be an act related to a distinct agent (*byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel ba'i las*). To state examples, such as *gser 'gyur rtsi*¹² *yiś lcags gser du bsgyur ba* ("Iron is/will be changed into gold by the alchemical elixir"):

gser du bsgyur bya'i lcags ("The iron that is to be changed into gold")
sgyur pa po ("the changer," "the alchemist")
gser du sgyur bar byed ("[He] changes [it] into gold")
 [141] *gser du bsgyurd zin* ("[It] has been changed into gold")
gser du sgyurd cig ("Change [it] into gold!").

And:

gnas nas dbyung bya'i gte po ("The ringleader who is to be expelled from the place")
'byin pa po ("the expeller")
gnas nas 'byin par byed ("[He] expels [him] from the place")
gnas nas phyung zin ("[He] has been expelled from the place")
gnas nas phyungs shig ("Expel [him] from the place!").¹³

¹¹ *gSer tog* contrasts *bya byed las gsum gyi dus gsum* ("the three times in terms of actions, agents, and objects") and *spyir dus gsum* ("the three times generally"). See chapter X above for the details. As he points out, there are cases where the context or the use of certain auxiliaries show that the present stem, i.e., the "dictionary form," is being used to indicate an event that *will* occur later relative to the speech act. This is the point of his example where the verb 'dul in *slar 'dul dgos pa* ("have to discipline again") is indeed a present stem but shows the temporal future (*dus kyi dus ma 'ongs pa*) because of the word *slar* ("again").

¹² See Lokesh Candra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary* (Kyoto: Rinsen, 1976), s.v. *gser 'gyur rtsi* = *rasa* ("mercury"; "the alchemical elixir"). Literally, "the extract for changing [something] into gold". Cf. also *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo*, s.v. *gser 'gyur: lcags sogs gser du bsgyur nas gyur pa'i don*.

¹³ See s.v. 'byin in Goldstein *op. cit.* "*gnas nas 'byin*; to kick out, to fire from a job/

Such are [examples showing] how we get different written forms (*yig gzugs*)¹⁴ according to the actions and agents.

§15. When an object and action seem to be established all by themselves (*rang gi ngang gis*), without directly having any distinct agent (*byed pa po gzhan*), this is said to be an act that is not related to a distinct agent (*byed pa po gzhan dang ma 'brel ba 'i las*). Let's state some examples. Suppose a round lump of iron in front of some or another person spontaneously changed into gold all by itself [we would use the following expressions]:

gser du 'gyur bya 'i lcags (“the iron that is to change [by itself] into gold”)

gser du 'gyur bzhin pa (“[It] is now changing into gold”)

gser du gyurd zin (“[It] has changed into gold”)

gser du 'gyur zhig (“May [it] change into gold!”).

And:

gnas nas 'byung bya 'i dge slong (“the monk who is to go out from the place”)

gnas nas 'byung bzhin pa (“[He] is now going out from the place”)

gnas nas byung zin (“[He] has gone out from the place”)

gnas nas 'byung zhig (“May [he] go out from the place!”).

In such cases, the account of actions, agents and objects applies, but there are two ways that it applies: *a*) [different] meanings apply without the written forms changing accordingly [or] *b*) they apply with different written forms.¹⁵

position.” See also *ibid. s.v. gte po* “ringleader, principal criminal, chief conspirator/schemer.”

¹⁴ Literally, “forms of letters.”

¹⁵ The point is that many intransitive (*tha mi dad pa*) verbs simply remain invariable in all tenses, while some others, like *'gyur ba* or *'byung ba*, do have differing forms for the past and the present/future. *gSer tog* allows that intransitives can be talked about in terms of actions, agents, and objects. In what follows, however, he shows how that analysis is not at all the same as in the case of transitive (*tha dad pa*) verbs, i.e., those where the agent and object/patient are different (*tha dad*). Other grammarians—especially the

§16. In this vein, when the iron itself (*rang nyid*) changes into gold, [this] is due to the activity of¹⁶ its elements [142], but is not due to an agent distinct from the elements. This is because while [the change] may indeed be due to the activity of the merit (*bsod nams* = *punya*) of the person in question, and the merit itself, which is like an agent, is something other [than the iron], still [the merit] does not directly appear (*ngos su mi snang ba*) [as a distinct agent acting upon the iron to change it into gold]. When the monk himself (*rang nyid*) goes out from a place without there being anyone who expels him from [that] place, there is not directly any distinct agent (*byed pa po gzhan ngos su med pa*), only just the [monk] himself who is the agent. If we analyze well cases such as these, an unmistakable certainty will arise concerning the meaning of the triad actions, agents, and object, [acts] being related or not to a distinct agent, and the meaning of self and other.

§17. Moreover, when things are gathered (*bsdu ba*) inwardly from the edges, but in direct dependence on the effort of a person (*skyes bu'i rtsol ba*) [we have the following]:

bsdu bya (“what is to be gathered”)

sdud pa po (“the gatherer”)

sdud byed (“what effectuates the gathering,” “the means of gathering”)

sdud bzhin (“[He] is now gathering”)

bsdus zin (“[It] has been gathered”)

sdud par 'gyur (“[He] will gather”)

sdus shig (“Gather!”).

And when scattered things assemble in one place:

nineteenth century writer dByangs can Grub pa'i rdo rje—did apply the term “agent” to *'gro ba po* (“goer”) and other such forms of intransitive verbs, and even spoke of them as showing self (*bdag*). However, they also insisted that this was not the genuine sense of the grammatical term “self,” i.e., self properly speaking (*bdag ngos*), but only a secondary sense of “self” (*bdag don phal ba*). The issue and the different points of view of grammarians are presented more fully in our n. 44 to §45 below. See also Tillemans 1991a.

¹⁶ We read *rang gi 'byung ba rnams kyi byed pas* rather than the text's *rang gi 'byung ba rnams kyi byed pas*. The passage is closely based on Si tu, and the former reading is what is found in Si tu. See AACT p. 69, §8.

btu bya
sdud pa po
sdud par byed
sdud bzhin
btus zin
sdud par 'gyur
*sdud cig.*¹⁷

These kinds of different written forms that we have shown above apply in several ways, and thus it is important to study them thoroughly and determinedly.

§18. In this treatise [i.e., in śloka twelve of the *rTags kyi 'jug pa*], [Thon mi] put forth a division into self and other in order to include words for agents (*byed pa po*) and focuses of action (*bya ba 'i yul*). In that [self-other division] are present doing (*byed bzhin da lta ba*), future thing-done and doing (*bya 'gyur dang byed 'gyur ma 'ongs pa*), and past accomplished thing-done (*bya ba byas zin 'das pa*). To include what is not pervaded (*ma khyab pa*) by the divisions of self and other, [Thon mi] put forth the division in terms of the three times (*dus gsum gyi dbye ba mdzad pa*).¹⁸

§19. Thus, in this context, it is absolutely indispensable to understand such distinctions as: (a) why all uses of sentences that involve actions (*byed las dang 'brel ba 'i ngag gi sbyor ba*)¹⁹ are pervaded by the three

¹⁷ It seems that gSer tog is once again contrasting transitive and intransitive verbs. However, the passage is problematic as the verbs *sdud pa/thu ba* admit of many variant forms. See Hill 2010, 'thu ३, which seems to be the closest to what gSer tog has in mind. Note that in *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo*, 'thu ba is given as *tha mi dad pa*, i.e., intransitive, and has the past form *btus pa*, the future *btu ba* and the imperative *thus*. I prefer to leave the examples untranslated here.

¹⁸ In §18-19 gSer tog is elaborating on a key passage from Si tu. See AACT, 62, §4. See chapter VIII, n. 10 for an emendation to our earlier translation.

¹⁹ We have somewhat tentatively taken *byed las* in the phrase *byed las dang 'brel ba 'i ngag gi sbyor ba thams cad* in the ordinary sense of “action,” rather than as the technical grammatical term “act-qua-doing.” See n. 9. The other possibility is to translate the phrase as we did in AACT 62, §4, viz., “all uses of sentences which involve act-qua-doing [and act-qua-thing-done].” The rationale for translating in the present fashion is a methodological one: simplicity and the avoidance of heavy reliance on square bracketed passages that decide an interpretation. Our translation in AACT was motivated by the fact that the phrase was glossed by Si tu’s commentator dNgul chu Dharmabhadra

temporal divisions (*dus gsum gyi dbye bas ... thams cad la khyab pa*) but the division into self and other is not pervasive to that extent (*de tsam du khyab pa min pa*) [i.e., the division into self and other does not pervade all uses of the three times]; (b) why the expressions for thing-done and doing (*bya byed kyi tshig*) [like *bsgrub par bya* and *sgrub par byed*], which involve actions and which both have the same force (*phan tshun shed mtshungs pa*), are also included in divisions of self and other.²⁰

§20. 2. To take the second [outline], i.e., the actual explanation as to why the [prefixes] are applied: In order to show what reasons there are for applying the prefixes (*sngon 'jug*) to the radical letters (*ming gzhi 'i yi ge*)²¹ the following is said: Amongst the five prefix-letters, the masculine letter *b-*, is, in terms of the three times, applied to show past accomplished

as *bya byed kyi las dang 'brel ba'i ngag gi sbyor ba thams cad* “all uses of sentences involving act-qua-thing-done and act-qua-doing” (see AACT 62, §4 and n. 12). The disadvantage of such a translation is that Dharmabhadra’s gloss in terms of *bya las* and *byed las* would seem to imply that Si tu and gSer tog were only talking about transitive verbs. This would clash with the idea that the three times apply to all verbs, be they transitive or intransitive. One could also perhaps argue, with the contemporary grammarian Tshe rdor, that *bya byed dang 'brel ba'i ngag gi sbyor ba* is not limited to transitive verbs but includes intransitives—in support one might cite gSer tog’s §15, where he clearly recognizes applications of *bya* and *byed* to intransitives. See also n. 44. I leave the question open as to the merits of that twenty-first century reinterpretation of Dharmabhadra’s gloss. In any case, adopting Tshe rdor’s interpretation, the details of the translation might perhaps differ a bit, but the upshot would end up essentially the same as translating *byed las* by “(any and all) actions.” Cf. Müller-Witte 2009, 209 *et seq.* on the different understandings of the key phrase *byed las dang 'brel ba'i ngag gi sbyor ba thams cad*.

²⁰ Expressions (like *sgrub par byed*) that show act-qua-doing (*byed pa'i las*), and those (such as *bsgrub par bya*) that show act-qua-thing-done (*bya ba'i las*), are necessarily co-existing correlates, with only a difference of voice, viz., agent- vs patient- prominence. The idea goes back to Si tu (AACT 62, §3-4). See also chapter VIII. On the term *phan tshun shed mtshung pa*, see chapter VIII, n. 10.

²¹ The *ming gzhi* is the main letter to which prefixes, superscripts, subscripts and suffixes are added. Cf. *Dag yig gsar bsgrigs s.v. ming: ming gzhi ni sgra sbyor gyi yi ge'i tshig bar gcig gi nang gi yi ge rtsa ba ste dmangs lta bur mtshon na ma ni ming gzhi 'i yi ge yin /*. “The radical is the root letter in one syllable in the use of a word. To take something like *dmangs*, *ma* is the radical letter.”

act-qua-thing-done (*bya ba'i las byas zin 'das pa*) that is related to a distinct agent. [143] For example:

snod bkang (“The receptacle has been filled”)
chu rgyun bkag (“The stream of water has been stopped”).

And:

bkang (“...has been filled”)
bkag (“... has been stopped”).

§21. It is due to the power of the word *dang* (*dang sgra*, “and”) [in the first line of śloka twelve] that [the prefix *b-*] applies [also] to things-to-be-done (*bya 'gyur*) that are related to distinct agents (*byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel ba*) or to future acts-qua-thing-done (*bya las ma 'ong pa*).²² For example:

bklag par bya (“... is to be read”)
bskor bar bya (“... is to be turned around/circumambulated”)
bklag bya (“what is to be read”)
bskor bya (“what is to be turned around”)
bklag (“... should be read,” “...will be read”)
bskor (“... should be turned around,” “...will be turned around”).

§22. Amongst self and other, [the prefix *b-*] is applied for the entity other (*dngos po gzhan*), i.e., the focus of an action related with a distinct agent, as in the following examples:

bzhog bya'i shing (“the wood that is to be split”)
bskul bya'i chos (“the Dharma that is to be promulgated”).

²² In effect, gSer tog argues that when Thon mi said “past and other” (*'das dang gzhan*) he supposedly meant “the past and the entity other, *inter alia*,” so that *b-* is not limited to expressions for the past and the entity other (*dngos po gzhan*), like *bklag bya* or *bklag bya'i deb* (“the book to be read”), but can also apply, implicitly or via the sense, to future patient-prominent forms, like *bklag par bya* and *bklag go* (“... is to be read”). See §42 and n. 36 for more on gSer tog’s exegesis of *dang* as showing *sdud pa'i don* (“the conjunctive sense”).

§23. In terms of the triad actions, agents, and objects, [*b-*] is applied in order to establish an act-qua-thing-done (*bya ba'i las*) related with a distinct agent. For example:

nor brku bar bya (“The wealth is to be stolen”)
gzugs blta bar bya (“The form is to be looked at”)
brku bya (“what is to be stolen”)
blta bya (“what is to be looked at”)
brku (“... should be stolen,” “... will be stolen”)
blta (“...should be looked at,” “...will be looked at”).

§24. Furthermore, *brjod bya* (“what is to be said”), *brjod zin* (“...has been said”), *bshad bya* (“what is to be explained”), *bshad zin* (“...has been explained”), and the like, by means of the same written form [*brjod* and *bshad*], present words for the focus of the action as well as for the past that has been accomplished. [Future stems] such as *bcib pa* (“... will/should be ridden,” “mount,” “conveyance”), *bza' ba* (“...will/should be eaten,” “food”), and the like apply to the entity other without needing clarification by means of the particle *bya*. In the context of the neutral prefixes [*g-* and *d-*] that we will explain [below], [future stems such as] *gzung ba* (“...will/should be grasped,” “what is to be grasped”), *gzhal ba* (“... will/should be measured,” “what is to be measured”) and the like state words for the focus [of the action], even without the particle *bya* (*bya tshig*).

§25. In the case of an entity other such as *brgyan par bya* (“...is to be adorned”) and *bskor bar bya* (“... is to be turned around”), one does not get the *da drag* (i.e., “the supplementary suffix *--d'*”).²³ Therefore, when one adds the finalizing particle [*-o*] (*slar bsdu*) or the various [periphrastic] expressions with the particle *bya* (*bya tshig gi tshig sna*)[144], one gets

²³ The supplementary suffix (*da drag*) was used after the suffixes (*rjes 'jug*) *-n*, *-r* and *-l* before the ninth century orthographic reform known as *skad gsar gcad*. *gSer tog* seems to allow it also as a deliberate archaism in a “stylized usage.” With verbs it is especially used in the past. It is clear that the supplementary suffix is also, on occasion, used with present forms like *'dzind* (“grasp”). *gSer tog* advises against using future *bya* forms like *btsald bya*, because *btsald* would show only the past (*'das pa*) of the verb *rtsol ba* (“strive”); a combination of a definite past form with a future ending in *bya* is incoherent for him. The problem arises because *btsal* itself can be either past (*'das pa*) or future (*ma 'ongs pa*).

[the future forms] *brgyan no* [and] *bskor ro*, but one does not get *brgyan to* and the like. And though the *da drag* has been long applied in cases such as *btsald bya*, the *da drag* cannot possibly show both the focus of the action and the past together. Thus, though we might, because of the [intended] sense (*don gyis*) [of *btsald bya*], get it [being used] for the entity other, one should eliminate the *da drag* in the written form *btsal bya*, and so we will not get the *da drag* [used] for the focus of an action or other. In the context of the neutral [i.e., *g-*, *d-*] and feminine [i.e., ‘*a-*’] prefixes that we shall explain [below], even though the *da drag* may be applied for an entity self, as in ‘*dzind* (“grasp”) [and] *gsold* (“beseech”), still, when one adds finalizing particles (*slar bsdu*) or various [other] particles, one should know how to distinguish between the following: (a) the [forms] showing present doing (*byed pa da lta ba*) where the *da drag* has been eliminated, such as ‘*dzin no* [and] *gsol lo*, and (b) the stylized [archaic] usages conveying doing (*byed pa zin pa’i nyams dod pa rnams*) where we do still get the *da drag*, as in ‘*dzind to* [and] *gsold to*.

§26. In terms of [the prefixes] that have been explained and those that will be explained [below],

bsten par bya (“... is to be relied upon”)
bsten bya (“what is to be relied upon”)
bsten (“... should be relied upon,” “... will be relied upon”)
gtang bar bya (“... is to be sent”)
gtang bya (“what is to be sent”)
gtang (“... should be sent,” “... will be sent”)
dpyad par bya (“... is to be analyzed”)
dpyad bya (“what is to be analyzed”)
dpyad (“... should be analyzed,” “... will be analyzed”)
mchod par bya (“... is to be offered”)
mchod bya (“what is to be offered”)
mchod (“... should be offered,” “... will be offered”)

and the like are applications for the object (*las*), or the future act-qua-thing-done (*bya las ma ’ongs pa*), or the entity other (*dnagos po gzhan*).

§27. *sten pa po* (“relier”)
sten par byed (“... relies”)
sten byed (“what effectuates the reliance,” “the means of relying”)
sten (“...relies”)

*gtong ba po, gtong bar byed, gtong byed, gtong,
dpyod pa po, dpyod par byed, dpyod byed, dpyod,
mchod pa po, mchod par byed, mchod byed, mchod,*

and so forth are applications for the entity self (*dngos po bdag*) or the doing (*byed pa*).

§28. In the following, [the prefixes] show together:

(a) accomplished thing-done (*bya ba byas zin*) and the temporally past (*dus kyi dus 'das pa*), as in

bstend par byas (“... has been relied upon”)
bstend zin (“... has been relied upon”)
bstend (“... has been relied upon”)
btang bar byas, btang zin, btang,
dpyad par byas, dpyad zin, dpyad,
mchod par byas, mchod zin, mchod;

(b) what one is doing (*byed bzhin*) and the temporally present (*dus kyi dus da lta ba*), as in

sten (“...relies”)
gtong, dpyod, mchod;

(c) what is to be done (*bya 'gyur*) and the temporally future (*dus kyi dus ma 'ongs pa*) both, as in

bsten (“... will be relied upon”)
gtang, dpyad, mchod.

§29. Amongst the three times that are not pervaded by the divisions of self and other spoken about in this context [i.e., in Thon mi’s śloka twelve], there are the following applications:

The past:

grub (“... has been established” intransitive [*tha mi dad pa, byed med las tshig*])
'dus (“... has come together” intr.)
byung (“... has occurred” intr.). [145]

The present:

'grub bzhin (“... is now becoming established” intr.)

'grub (“... is established” intr.)

'du bzhin (“... is now coming together” intr.)

'du (“... comes together” intr.)

'byung bzhin (“... is now occurring” intr.)

'byung (“... occurs” intr.).

The future:

'grub par 'gyur (“... will/would be established” intr.)

'grub 'gyur (“... will be established” intr.)

'grub (“... will be established” intr.)

'du bar 'gyur, 'du 'gyur, 'du,

'byung bar 'gyur, 'byung 'gyur, 'byung.

As for [verb phrases] where the same written forms (*yig gzugs gcig pa*) occur with or without various particles added to them, there are many [uses of such verbs] that are individually settled cases (*so so'i bab*), have to be understood inferentially (*dpags te shes dgos pa*) in terms of the [semantic] capabilities of the preceding and subsequent expressions (*snga phyi'i tshig gi nus pa*), and so on and so forth. However, they cannot all be written up. We would expend paper and ink, but there would be no further purpose [that would be accomplished]. So [phrases] such as “the pustule that has ripened is ready to be lanced” (*rnag smin pa rtol ran pa*) and “the fruit that is ripe is ready to be eaten” (*shing tog smin pa za ran pa*) will just be cases that stand out for analysis if there are some lucky disciples that come along later.²⁴

²⁴ Note that *smin pa* (“... is ripe,” “...ripens,” “... has ripened,” “...will ripen”) is indeed an intransitive verb (*byed med las tshig, tha mi dad pa*) that has the same form as past, present, and future stem. *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* gives the following for *rnag smin pa*: *rdol ran pa'i rnag rnyings pa* “a longstanding pus[tule] that is ready to burst open.” To speculate a bit, it seems that in gSer tog’s first example *smin pa* might be understood as the past form, i.e., the pustule that had previously ripened, or that has ripened to the point where it can now be lanced. In the other case, *smin pa* may be the present, i.e., “the fruit that is ripe.”

§30. In [A lag sha Ngag dbang] bstan dar’s commentary, when it is stated that there are applications [of *b-*] for the future such as “That cloth is to be washed tomorrow” (*ras de sang nyin bkru bar bya*) and “That letter is still to be read” (*yi ge de da dung bklag par bya’o*), I wonder whether this might be a corrupt explanation (*bam bshad*) [of the prefix *b-* being used for the temporally future]. In keeping with what [bsTan dar’s] example statements actually said (*dnegos bstan*), the words *sang nyin* (“tomorrow”) and *da dung* (“still”) show the temporally future (*dus kyi dus ma ‘ongs pa*), but *bkru bar bya* (“... is to be washed”) and *bklag par bya* (“... is to be read”) are no more than just the future act-qua-thing-done (*bya las ma ‘ongs pa*).²⁵

§31. Now, generally (*spyir*), in cases of acts pertaining to the basis of the action (*bya ba gzhi la yod pa’i las*), [verb phrases] such as *bklag bya* (“what is to be read,” “... is to be read”) are applied for the future act-qua-thing-done, the temporally future, as well as for the actual expression

²⁵ See AACT p. 16-18 and chapter X (above) on this argument of A lag sha Ngag dbang bstan dar (1759-1840), a Mongolian who wrote in Tibetan and had a considerable influence on gSer tog—as is clear from the repeated references to him in other parts of gSer tog’s *mchan ‘grel* (see §§42, 48, 53). On p. 186 of bsTan dar’s *Sum rtags* commentary, *sKal ldan yid kyi pad ma ‘byed pa’i snang ba’i mdzod*, we find: *gzhung ‘dir dnegos su ma bstan kyang ma ‘ongs pa la ‘jug pa ni / dper na / ras de sang nyin bkru par bya’o / yi ge de da dung bklag par bya’o sogs so /*. “Although not actually taught in this text [i.e., the *rTags kyi ‘jugs pa*] there are the following cases where [*b-*] does apply to the future: ‘That cloth is to be washed tomorrow,’ ‘That letter is still to be read,’ and so forth.” bsTan dar, therefore, maintains that *b-* prefix applies to both past and future. gSer tog does accept bsTan dar’s and Si tu’s general position (see §31 and §48) that the śloka twelve’s specification of tenses admits of many exceptions, including future verb phrases. He shows, in §48, how at least three lines of śloka twelve would have to be thoroughly amended, if we were to require complete coverage, or “pervasion” (*khyab pa = vyāpti*), of all the linguistic phenomena. gSer tog, however, is skeptical about the particular examples that bsTan dar gives, arguing that *bkru bar bya* (“... is to be washed”) and *bklag par bya* (“... is to be read”) are not in themselves temporally future (*dus kyi dus ma ‘ongs pa*). He says, in effect, that in themselves they show patient-prominence, or thing-done (*bya las*), and are only “future” in the sense of *bya las ma ‘ongs pa*, i.e., as modal, patient-prominent forms rather than genuine conveyors of future time. In sum, for gSer tog, the examples given by bsTan dar are misleading tricks: the temporal future (*dus kyi dus ma ‘ongs pa*), or future time *stricto sensu*, in such examples is not conveyed by “... *par bya*” but by words like “tomorrow” (*sang nyin*) and “still” (*da dung*).

for the object (*las kyi sgra dngos*). *bklags zin* (“... has been read”) and so forth, which are both temporally past (*dus kyi dus ‘das pa*) and past accomplished thing-done (*bya ba byas zin ‘das pa*), are related to the basis of the action. *klog par byed* (“... reads”) and the like, which are acts-qua-doing, present doing (*byed bzhin da lta ba*), and temporally present (*dus da lta ba*), are related to the agent.

§32. As for the neutral prefixes, *g-* [and] *d-*, in terms of the pair self and other related to a distinct agent,²⁶ they are applied to radicals (*ming gzhi*) for both (*gnyis ka*) [possibilities, i.e., self and other]: i.e., (a) for what is the agent, viz., the entity self, as well as for the act-qua-doing related to that [agent], and (b) for what is the entity other pertaining to the action, as well as for the thing-done related to that [entity] (*de ‘brel gyi bya ba*). Let us state some examples [showing] application of the letter *g-* for the entity self:

khirms gcod pa po (“a decider of laws,” “a judge”)
sbyin pa gtong ba po (“a giver”).

Applications for the doing related to self (*bdag ‘brel gyi byed pa la ‘jug pa*):

[146] *gcod par byed* (“... cuts”)
gcod byed (“what effectuates the cutting,” “means of cutting”)
gcod (“... cuts”)

²⁶ It is quite unclear to me how the phrase that is to be found in the text, viz., *ming gzhi la byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i las*, could ever be integrated into the syntax of gSer tog’s sentence. Fortunately, we have a completely parallel passage in §39 where gSer tog describes the uses of the prefix ‘a- saying: *sngon ‘jug gi mo ‘a yig ni / ming gzhi la byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i bdag gzhan gnyis las dngos po bdag dang ... la ‘jug pa*. We conclude that the copyist just left out the words *bdag gzhan gnyis* in our troublesome passage: being used to seeing the term *byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i las*, he wrote this instead of *byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i bdag gzhan gnyis las*, which must be the correct reading. At any rate, the idea of gSer tog’s commentary on the phrase *gnyis ka la ‘jug pa* in Thon mi’s verse is clear enough: on the one hand, *g-* and *d-* prefixed expressions can apply to self, namely agents and the acts related to agents; on the other hand, they can apply to other—objects and their corresponding acts.

gtong bar byed (“... sends”)
gtong byed (“what effectuates the sending,” “means of sending”)
gtong (“... sends”).

Applications for the entity other (*dnegos po gzhan la 'jug pa*):

gcad bya 'i shing (“the wood that is to be cut”)
gtang bya 'i nor (“the wealth to be sent”).

Applications for the thing-done (*bya ba la 'jug pa*):

gcad par bya (“... is to be cut”)
gcad bya (“what is to be cut”)
gcad (“... will/should be cut”)
gtang bar bya (“... is to be sent”)
gtang bya (“what is to be sent”)
gtang (“... will/should be sent”).

§33. Let us [now] state examples of the applications of the letter *d-* for the entity self:

gting dpog pa po (“one who fathoms the depths”)
dka' gnas dpyod pa po (“one who analyzes the difficult points”).

Applications for the doing related to that [entity] (*de 'brel gyi byed pa*):

dpog par byed (... “understand [inferentially],” “... infers,” “... measures,” “... fathoms”)
dpog byed (“what effectuates the understanding,” “means of understanding”)
dpog [147] (“... understands”)
dpyod par byed (“... analyzes”)
dpyod byed (“what effectuates the analyzing,” “means of analysis”)
dpyod (“... analyzes”).

Applications for the entity other:

dpag bya 'i lkog gyur (“the imperceptible [entity] to be understood”)
dpayad bya 'i don (“the meaning to be analyzed”).

Applications for the thing-done related to that [entity] (*de 'brel gyi bya ba*):

dpag par bya (“... is to be understood”)

dpag bya (“what is to be understood”)

dpag (“... will be understood”)

dpyad par bya (“... is to be analyzed”)

dpyad bya (“what is to be analyzed”)

dpyad (“... will/should be analyzed”).

§34. Among the three times [of actions] that are related with a distinct agent, [the prefixes *g-* and *d-*] are applied to show principally (*gtso bor*) the present (*da lta ba*). Let us state some examples where the letter *g-* is applied for the present:

shing gcod (“... cuts the wood”)

sbyin pa gtong (“... gives”)

'og tu gnon (“... suppresses”)

sman gdu (“... brews the medicine”).

To state some examples where the letter *d-* is applied for the present:

rig pas dpyod kyin [148] (“... analyzes with intelligence”)

zho dkrog gin (“... stirs up the yoghurt”)

logs su dgar gyin (“... sets aside”)

skud pas dkri yin 'dug (“... ties [it] up with thread”).

§35. In connection with the neutral [prefixes *g-*, *d-*] as well as the feminine [*'a-*] and extremely feminine [prefix *m-*] that will be explained [below], there is a [point] that should be understood. Take [phrases] such as *gcad bya* (“what is to be cut”), *gcod byed* (“what effectuates the cutting,” “the means of cutting”), *dpag bya* (“what is to be understood”) [and] *dpog byed* (“what effectuates the understanding,” “means of understanding”), where [the prefixes] *g-* [and] *d-* are applied for both self and other via different written forms [i.e., *gcod*, *gcad*, *dpog*, *dpag*, etc.]. Then, even when the particles *bya* [and] *byed* and auxiliaries (*tshig grogs*) are not used, these [simplex forms, i.e., *gcad*, *gcod*, etc.] enable one to understand that it is [respectively] future act-qua-thing-done (*bya las ma 'ongs pa*) and present doing (*byed pa da lta ba*) [at stake]. By contrast, take [phrases] such as *gtsub bya* (“what is to be rubbed”), *gtsub byed* (“what effectuates the

rubbing,” “means of rubbing”), *dkri bya* (“what is to be tied up”) [and] *dkri byed* (“what effectuates the tying,” “the means of tying”), where *g-* [and] *d-* are applied for both self and other via one and the same written form [i.e., *gsub* and *dkri*, respectively].²⁷ In those cases, when [the simplex forms *gsub* and *dkri*] are not clarified by means of the particle *byed*, then by using one of the four auxiliaries *kyin*, *gin*, *gyin*, [or] *yin*, [the verb phrases] *gsub kyin*, *dkri yin* and the like convey present doing (*byed pa da lta ba*)—such is one way they convey [meaning] (*ston tshul gcig*). And when *g-* [and] *d-* are applied for both self and other via one and the same written form [as in the case of *gsub* and *dkri*], then if they are applied specifically (*dmigs kyis*) for the times (*dus*), *gsub kyin*, *dkri yin* and so forth clearly convey the temporally present (*dus kyi dus da lta ba*), while by using auxiliaries [in verbal forms] such as *gsub par gyur* (“... will rub”) [and] *dkri bar gyur* (“... will tie up”), they clearly convey the temporally future (*dus kyi dus ma ’ongs pa*). Such is another way. Given the two ways (*tshul gnyis*), then self, other, and the three times needed to be spoken about separately here in the root text [i.e., in śloka twelve of the *rTags kyi jug pa*].²⁸

²⁷ The verbs *gsub pa* (“rub”) and *dkri ba* (“tie up”) each have the same forms for their present and future, although they do each have separate past forms.

²⁸ *gSer tog* is taking *gnyis ka* (“both self and other”) in the second line of Thon mi’s śloka as covering verb phrases in *byed* or *bya*, such as *gsub (par) byed* or *gsub par bya*. In *gSer tog*’s eyes, Thon mi’s *da lta* (“present”) covers two types of present using auxiliaries like *kyin*, *yin*, etc, one showing the agent-prominent voice of the action, the “present doing” (*byed pa da lta ba*), the other showing that the action is actually occurring now, i.e., in the temporally present (*dus kyi dus da lta ba*). See also §44 below: “*da lta* (“present”) [in the second line of śloka twelve] ... showed both the present doing (*byed pa da lta ba*) and the temporally present (*dus kyi da lta ba*) with the same force (*shed mtshungs*).”

It is not clear to me, however, that what *gSer tog* says about *gsub kyin* is exactly Si tu’s position. Si tu had argued that *all* uses of auxiliaries, like *kyin*, *bzhin*, ‘*gyur*, were excluded from self because there were no correlated expressions showing other that would have the “same force” (*stobs mtshungs* = *shed mtshungs*) as them. Cf. n. 29 below. *gSer tog*, on the other hand, seems to be claiming that *gsub*—which is both the present and future stem— can take auxiliaries like *kyin* or other periphrastic constructions when the dominant intention is to disambiguate voice. He thus speaks of two possible ways in which *gsub kyin* and the like can convey meaning (*ston pa ’i tshul*): they can be used to show simply doing (*byed pa*), i.e., the agent-prominent voice (roughly, as in “he rubs it,” “he is rubbing it”), or they can be used with the specific intention to show temporal

§36. Also, in the commentary of Si tu [Pañ chen], it is said that [g- and d-] are applied for cases of present time that are not included in the afore-mentioned [categories of] self and other. This arrives at the sense of what is said in [Thon mi's] text about applications [of the prefixes] for the three times (*dus gsum kyi 'jug pa*), and thus, I understood it to be the best explanation.²⁹

value (as in “he rubs it right now”). In the latter case, *gtsub kyin* would, presumably, not come under self. The question then arises: Does gSer tog (contrary to Si tu) admit *gtsub kyin* as showing self when it shows doing?

Finally, it should be noted that Thon mi's verse remains problematic on gSer tog's exegesis. As we saw in §34, when Thon mi says *da lta ba* (“present”), he is, according to gSer tog, only describing how g- and d- are principally (*gtso bor*) used. Hence, gSer tog also allows that there can be temporally future (*dus kyi dus ma 'ongs pa*), periphrastic verb phrases using the auxiliary 'gyur, such as *gtsub par 'gyur* (“... will rub”). However, as he explains in §44, those temporal futures are supposedly “gotten (i.e., understood, acquired) [indirectly] via the sense [of Thon mi's words]” (*don gyis thob pa*). In effect, he admits that, on his (and Si tu's) exegesis, the verse's words are far from exhaustive and need to be extensively supplemented to be watertight. The same theme of the lack of completeness in what Thon mi literally says is taken up in §48 where gSer tog shows how the verse would have to be amended if it were to be a rigorous description of the uses of the prefixes.

²⁹ gSer tog is, no doubt, thinking of a difficult passage in Si tu pp. 234-235; D. 74b3-75a1: *ma ning gi sngon 'jug gnyis po de bshad ma thag pa'i bdag gzhan gnyis po der mi gtogs pa'i dus da lta ba la 'jug pa'i tshul ni / byed pa po bdag dang 'brel ba'i byed pa'i tshig gi dper brjod pa de rnams nyid tshig grogs kyi bsgyur ba las shes par bya'o // de'ang dper na / gcar bar byed / gcar ro / dkri bar byed / dkri'o / lta bu da lta ba'i sgra yin mod kyi gzung bar bya / gzung ngo / dgang bar bya / dgang ngo / lta bu gzhan gyi sgra la'ang de dang shed mtshungs yod pas sngar stobs mtshungs kyi bdag gzhan du zlas phye ba'i bdag sgra'i khongs su bsdu nas brjod zin pas 'dir ni don gyis bdag byed pa'i tshig yin yang gzhan gyi sgra la de dang shed mtshungs sbyar rgyu med pas gong smos bdag sgra'i khongs su sdud par mi 'os pa'i / gcar gyin snang ngo / gcar bzhin pa'o / dkri yin 'dug go / dkri bzhin pa'o / lta bu sngar smros pa'i bdag sgra'i byed tshig de rnams nyid brjod tshul tshig grogs kyi khyad par dang bcas pas dper brjod par bya'o //* “Here is the way the two neutral prefixes [g- and d-] are used for the present tense [forms] that are not included amongst either the self or other [verb forms] that we have just given: it has to be understood that the various examples of expressions for ‘doing’ that are related with the agent, i.e., with self, stem from transformations through auxiliaries. Now, *gcar bar byed*, *gcar ro*, *dkri bar byed*, *dkri'o*, and the like certainly are present tense expressions. And in the case of expressions for ‘other’ too, like *gzung bar bya*, *gzung ngo*, *dgang bar bya*,

§37. Concerning the auxiliaries of these [verbal forms], *gtsub bzhin* (“... is rubbing now”) [and] *dkri bzhin* (“... is tying up now”) have been used in many commentaries. However, the term “auxiliary” (*tshig grogs*; literally “companion-word”) in this context is not anything like an association by friendship, but means the use of a particle (*tshig phrad*) endowed with a [certain] capability. Consequently, while the four [particles] *kyin*, etc. are used as auxiliaries for the present and ‘*gyur*’ is used as an auxiliary for the future, the word *bzhin* itself is applied for several meanings, including, amongst others, in order to convey the present. So I think that it would not [itself] be an auxiliary.³⁰

§38. As for the assertion by many scholars that words for actions, agents, and objects that are related to self and other are present, [their reasoning was as follows:] When wood is cut by an axe, one is doing now (*byed bzhin yin pa*) the action of cutting, and so it is dubbed the act-qua-doing (*byed pa’i las*); the wood going now (‘*gro bzhin pa*’) into pieces is dubbed the act-qua-thing-done (*bya ba’i las*). Thus [both act-qua-doing and act-qua-thing-done, i.e., both self and other] are determined [by these scholars] to be in the present [as they involve what is happening now, i.e.,

dgang ngo, there are [expressions, like ‘*dzin par byed*, ‘*dzin no*, etc.] that have the same force as them. So earlier on [in Si tu’s list of examples of *g-* and *d-* prefixed verbs] they [i.e., *gcar bar byed*, etc.] had been stated included under ‘self’ when the classification in terms of self and other was made on account of [expressions for thing-done and doing] having the same force (*stobs mtshungs kyis*). Consequently, here [i.e., among the verb forms covered by the word ‘present’ (*da lta*) in Thon mi’s śloka on *g-* and *d-*], there are [verb phrases] like *gcar gyin snang ngo*, *gcar bzhin pa’o*, *dkri yin ‘dug go*, *dkri bzhin pa’o*, which are unfitting to be included under the ‘self’ expressions previously given [in the lists of *g-* and *d-* forms] in spite of them being by their sense (*don gyis*) expressions for doing, i.e., self, because ‘other’ expressions cannot be used having the same force as them (*gzhan gyi sgra la de dang shed mtshungs sbyar rgyu med pas*). The examples [of present *g-* and *d-* prefixed forms that were neither self nor other, i.e., *gcar gyin snang*, etc.] had to be stated because the types of presentation (*brjod tshul*) of the words for doing, or ‘self’ expressions, that had been given earlier were [now] provided with specific auxiliaries (*tshig grogs kyi khyad par dang bcas pas*).” See the detailed discussion of this passage in chapter VIII, n. 10 and 11.

³⁰ Presumably, *gSer tog*’s point is that *bzhin* has many other senses apart from its use in periphrastic verb phrases in order to indicate the present. It means “face,” “like,” “according to,” “even though,” etc. See Goldstein, *Tibetan-English Dictionary of Modern Tibetan*, s.v. *bzhin*.

byed bzhin pa and *'gro bzhin pa*]. But when Zha lu lo chen said that act-qua-thing-done are future, his idea was that they are future [events] that will have to be done (*bya 'gyur ma 'ongs pa*).³¹

§39. To take up the feminine prefix, the letter *'a-* in terms of the pair of self and other that is related with a distinct agent, it is applied to the radical (*ming gzhi*) for [showing] the entity self and the act-qua-doing.

To state some examples of applications for the entity self:

grub mtha' 'gog pa po (“a refuter of philosophical systems”)
gnas su 'jog pa po (“one who places [...] in a position”).

³¹ I cannot determine to which scholars gSer tog is referring when he says that “many scholars” hold that both act-qua-doing and act-qua-thing-done are present. In the other part of the passage, however, he is putting a common slant on Zha lu lo tsā ba Chos skyong bzang po (1441-1527) as emphasizing the “future act-qua-thing-done” expressed by *g-* and *d-* prefixed forms. Note that A kya Yongs 'dzin presents a similar view on Zha lu lo chen—see AACT, 42-44, §10—but then introduces the novel idea that Tibetan has a present passive, i.e., a present act-qua-thing-done (*bya ba da lta ba*), as in supposedly *b-*prefixed presents like *bsgrub bzhin pa* (“is being established”).

The usual discussions on this theme from Zha lu lo chen seem to me to go well beyond what Chos skyong bzang po himself actually said. The latter had simply stressed that *g-* and *d-* applied both to the present and to the future but that such a fact did not represent a contradiction with Thon mi, who only spoke of the present here. His point was that Thon mi's verse only spoke of *principal* uses of the prefixes—an exegetical strategem that will be frequently used by later commentators, like gSer tog and others, too.

Here is a summary of Zha lu lo tsā ba's discussion in his *rTags kyi 'jug pa* commentary, i.e., *Zha lu sum rtags*, p. 27-30. On p. 27 he says that *g-* and *d-* apply principally (*gtso che ba*) to self, other, and the present. He then goes on to say on p. 28 that while *sbyin pa gtong ba* (“he gives gifts”), *shing gcod pa*, *sems can gsod pa*, and *'og tu gnon pa* are applications of *g-* for the present, the related forms without the *o* (*na ru*) vowel, viz., *gtang ba* (“what will be given,” “what is to be given”), *gcad pa*, *gsad pa*, and *gnan pa* are applications for a “future focus of the action” (*bya ba 'i yul ma 'ongs pa*). On p. 28-29 he concludes: “It is not contradictory to say that [*g-*] applies for the present when there seem to be several [examples] of *g-* prefix being applied for the future. This is because [Thon mi] said [‘present’] on account of the principal [use]” (*gas 'phul ma 'ongs pa la 'jug pa du ma snang bas da lta ba la 'jug par bshad pa dang mi 'gal te / gtso che ba 'i dbang gis gsungs pa 'i phyir ro /*). Note that these points are not taken up in *lCang skya sum rtags*, though it is said to be based on the commentary of Zha lu lo chen. See Schubert 1937, 59-60.

Applications for act-qua-doing:

'gog par byed (“... refutes”)

'gog byed (“what effectuates the refutation,” “means of refuting”)

'gog (“... refutes”)

'jog par byed (“... places”)

'jog byed (“what effectuates the placing,” “means of placing”)

'jog (“... places”).

§40. Given the power of the word *dang* (*dang sgra* “and”) [in śloka twelve], [‘a-] is also applied for the entity other that is related to a distinct agent. For example:

'khod par bya (“... is to be settled”)³²

'khod bya (“what is to be settled”)

'khod (“... will/should be settled”)

'bud par bya (“... is to be pushed out”) [150]

'bud bya (“what is to be pushed out”)

'bud (“... will/should be pushed out”).

§41. [The prefix ‘a-] is applied to show the temporally future from amongst the three times that are related to a distinct agent (*byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel ba 'i dus gsum*), and to show future thing-done and doing (*bya 'gyur dang byed 'gyur ma 'ongs pa*), which may or may not be related to the [distinct agent].

To state some examples of applications for the temporally future (*dus kyi dus ma 'ongs pa*):

'thab par 'gyur (“... will fight”)³³

'khod par 'gyur (“... will settle”).

³² The example is problematic in that both *Dag yig gsar bsgrigs* and *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* classify *'khod pa* (“exist,” “be settled,” “be written,” “be called”) as intransitive.

³³ The verb *'thab pa* is transitive and has only one form.

Applications for act-qua-thing-done:

'thab par bya (“...is to be fought”)

'thab bya (“what is to be fought”)

'thab (“...will be fought”)

'khod par bya, 'khod bya, 'khod.

§42. In the commentaries of Si tu Paṅ chen and bsTan dar lha rams pa [i.e., A lag sha Ngag dbang bstan dar], [Thon mi’s] root śloka was corrected and then stated as *mo ni bdag da ma 'ongs phyir* (“The feminine [prefix ‘a-] is for self, the present, the future”) [rather than *mo ni bdag dang ma 'ongs phyir* (“The feminine [prefix ‘a-] is for self and the future”)]—this seems [to have been done] with the pure intention that simple minds might understand more easily.³⁴ But let us once again give a condensed explanation of the meaning of the text’s śloka. When [Thon mi] said,

³⁴ gSer tog himself does not see this reading as necessary, but at most as having pedagogical value. Si tu, however, does comment on *da* (“present”) instead of *dang* (“and”). On Si tu p. 248 we get the following discussion of *da* versus *dang*: *'dir gzhung gi yig cha rnams su mo ni bdag dang ma 'ongs phyir / zhes pa yod cing 'grel byed snga ma rnams la 'ang dogs pa ma shar mod / de ni 'dir bstan gyi bdag gzhan dang dus gsum gyi dbye ba gzhung gi dgongs pa bzhin ma phyed pas nongs te / bdag gi tha snyad ma bstan pa 'i da lta ba 'i tshig 'a phul can mang du yod pa skabs 'dir bstan dgos pa ma shes par 'dug pa 'i phyir ro / des na gzhung de ltar bklags pa gzhung gi bstan bya ma rdzogs pa 'i skyon du 'gyur bas yig nor bryud par shes par byos la dkyus su bkod pa bzhin gzung bar bya 'o //*. “Here, there is [the reading] *mo ni bdag dang ma 'ongs phyir* in various texts, and doubt did not occur to the earlier commentators, either. But this [reading] does not classify the divisions of self, other, and the three times taught in this [verse] in keeping with the thought of the text, and thus it is mistaken. For, it was not understood that in this context it should be shown that there are many present [tense] words having the prefix ‘a- that were not indicated by the designation ‘self’ [in Thon mi’s verse]. Consequently, when the text has been read in that manner there will be the fault that what the text teaches is incomplete. So be aware that a mistaken reading has been transmitted! In the real text (*dkyus*)* [the reading] should be accepted as we have presented it.” *Cf. *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo s.v. dkyus: dpe cha 'i gzhung dngos*. Note that Ngag dbang bstan dar p. 187.3-6 echoes Si tu’s line of thought and gives a number of examples of ‘a- being used for the present: *sngon 'jug 'a yig da ltar ba la 'jug pa ni / skud pa 'khal bzhin pa / gdan la 'khod bzhin pa sogs dang / de bzhin du / 'jug / 'don / 'thor / 'gog / 'bul / 'tshol sogs 'a yig da ltar ba la 'jug pa mang du yod pa 'i phyir / yig cha rnams su / mo ni bdag dang ma 'ongs phyir // zhes byung ba yig nor du shes par byos la gong du bkod pa bzhin gzung bar bya 'o //*. Bacot 1946, 66 adopted Si tu’s reading, too.

pho ni 'das dang gzhan bsgrub phyir (“The masculine [prefix] is for establishing the past and other”),³⁵ stating the word *'das* (“past”) was for the following reasons: the temporally past (*dus kyi 'das pa*) was there, too, but especially (*bye brag tu*) [“past”] indicated the already accomplished thing-done (*bya ba byas zin pa*) related with a distinct agent. The word *dang* was not just a filler in the verse (*tshigs bcad kha skong tsam ma yin par*), but rather had a conjunctive sense (*sdud pa'i don*).³⁶ That is to say, [the prefix *b-*] is not only applied for the temporal past or what has been accomplished, but also for the future that is to be done (*bya 'gyur ma 'ongs pa*) [indirectly included via the sense].³⁷

§43. The word *gzhan* (“other”) [in the first line of verse twelve] is applied for the entity other of that action which is related to a distinct

³⁵ See n. 38 below.

³⁶ The natural translation of *dang* (“and”) in Thon mi’s verse is as the simple conjunction between two terms X and Y. This is what grammarians call *sdud pa* “conjunction” and is, of course, how most uses of *dang* are to be read, although there are other important uses, too. The *Sum cu pa* has five uses of *dang*: (1) *sdud pa* (“conjunction”), *'byed pa* (“disjunction”), *rgyu mtshan* (“reason”), *tshe skabs* (“time [of an event]”), *gdams ngag* (“imperative”). See Bacot 1946, 39, *gSer tog sum rtags*, 87-88, for the five *dang sgra 'i 'jug tshul*. *gSer tog*, however, seems to understand *sdud pa* here as conjoining “X and, amongst other things, Y.” Thus, in the first line of śloka twelve the *dang* supposedly includes future forms, besides explicitly conjoining the terms “past” and “other.” And in line three *dang* does not just conjoin “self” and “future,” but also allows the entity other, acts-qua-doing, and acts-qua-thing-done. See §§21, 40, 45. In short, besides conveying the conjunction between self/other and terms for the three times, *dang* serves to include verb forms that were not otherwise explicitly mentioned by Thon mi but were “obtained [indirectly] via the sense” (*don gyis thob pa*). See n. 40. Finally, as *gSer tog* makes clear, the *dang sgra* in Thon mi’s verse is not there simply to fill the place of a syllable in a verse that otherwise would lack the required number of syllables. His point is that *dang* is not like the particle *ni*. One of the uses of *ni* he talks about in his *Sum cu pa* commentary is indeed as *kha skong* (“a filler”), typically *metri causa*. *gSer tog sum rtags* p. 86: *kha skong ni brjod don gzhan ston rgyu med par tsheg bar gyi sa khongs tsam zhig 'dzin pa* “Being a filler means that it just takes the place of a syllable without having to show any difference in the expressed meaning.”

³⁷ “Future that is to be done” or “future [event] that will have to be done” (*bya 'gyur ma 'ongs pa*) is the same as “future act-qua-thing-done” (*bya las ma 'ongs pa*), i.e., verb forms in ... *par bya*. They can be included via the sense: grammarians include the future-qua-thing-done as other. Cf., however, n. 38, 40 below on the exegesis of *gSer tog*, Zha lu lo tsā ba, and Go rams pa bSod nams seng ge.

agent; the word *bsgrub* (“establishing”) [151] is applied for establishing act-qua-thing-done (*bya ba’i las*).³⁸ That is to say, the masculine [prefix]

³⁸ Note that gSer tog seems to understand *bsgrub*—the future form of *sgrub* (“establishes”)—as actually specifying a category of action, so that the first line of Thon mi’s verse specifies three possibilities for *ba-* i.e., “past,” “other,” and “what will be established,” rather than just two (“past” and “other”). If we wanted to translate Thon mi’s verse in accordance with this interpretation—one that I consider implausible—we would have “The masculine [prefix] is for the past and other [and] what will be established.” *lCang skya sum rtags* has this interpretation; see Schubert 1937, 58-59. Miller 1976, 491 pointed out that this interpretation of *bsgrub* occurs in Zha lu lo tsā ba Chos skyong bzang po (1441-1527) and hypothesized that “This interpretation has a good deal to recommend it, and it might well be that Dharmapālabhadra [= Chos skyong bzang po] is the only one of the commentators here not to have lost sight of the mnemonic basis of the passage which clearly determined the original choice of terms used.” I don’t think so. First, it is difficult to attach much weight to a would-be mnemonic argument about *bsgrub* beginning with a *b-*, and especially to the supposed implication that *therefore* the line describing the use of *b-* must include not only *gzhan* and ‘*das* but an additional category, i.e., *bya ba bsgrub*. Second, for better or worse, it seems that Zha lu lo tsā ba’s interpretation was not original nor confined to him: it seems relatively common in earlier and in later grammatical texts. Not just do later writers like gSer tog and lCang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje have it, but Go rams pa bSod nams seng ge (1429-1489), who was slightly anterior to Zha lu lo tsā ba, has it, too. See Go rams pa’s *rTags ‘jug gi tīkā* 2b-3a: *ci’i phyir zhes sogs tshig rkang lnga ste / pho yi yi ge ba ni / ‘das pa la ‘jug pa dang / gzhan pa la ‘jug pa dang / bya ba bsgrub pa la ‘jug pa gsum las ... gsum pa ni smon lam btab / sems bskyed ces pa lta bu’o //*. “Concerning the five lines beginning with ‘why [are the prefixes applied?],’ the masculine letter *ba-* is applied for the past, it is applied for other, and it is applied for thing-done that will be established (*bya ba bsgrub pa*). From these three, the third is [illustrated with examples] like *smon lam btab* (‘...prayers will be made’), *sems bskyed* (‘... the mind [of enlightenment] will be generated’).” Third, and most importantly, this interpretation is *not* borne out by Si tu, who clearly takes *bsgrub phyir* as going with ‘*das* and *gzhan*: Thon mi’s phrase ‘*das dang gzhan bsgrub phyir* is glossed as “for establishing the past” and “for establishing other.” See Si tu p. 209: *sngon ‘jug gi pho yig ba ni dgos pa dus gsum las / byed pa po gzhan dang dngos su ‘brel ba’i bya ba byas zin ‘das pa (b)sgrub pa’i phyir dang / dngos po bdag gzhan gnyis las gzhan te byed pa po gzhan dang dngos su ‘brel ba’i bya ba’i yul dang bya ba bsgrub pa’i ‘jug pa yin no //*. “As for the prefix letter *b-*, it is for the following needs: in terms of the three times, it is for establishing the past accomplished thing-done that is directly related with a distinct agent; and in terms of the pair, self and other, it is applied for establishing other, i.e., the focus of the action directly related to a distinct agent and the thing-done (*bya ba*).”

letter *b-* is applied to show principally (*gtso bor*) the following: in terms of the triad, actions, agents and objects (*bya byed las gsum*), [it is for] the focus of the action (*bya ba'i yul*) or object (*las*); in terms of self and other, the entity other; in terms of the three times, the past that has been accomplished.

§44. When [Thon mi] said, *ma ning gnyis ka da ltar ched* (“The neutral [prefixes] are for both [self and other][and] the present”), *ma ning* (“neutral”) refers to the pair *g-* and *d-*.³⁹ As for the word *gnyis ka* (“both”), the śloka [directly] spoke of applications for the entities self and other that are related to a distinct agent. Thus, in terms of the triad, actions, agents, and objects, the applications for acts-qua-doing related to self and those for the action or act related to other are gotten [indirectly] through the sense (*don gyis thob*) [of the śloka’s word “both”].⁴⁰ Turning to the word *da ltar* (“present”), in terms of the three times related to a distinct agent, it showed both the present doing (*byed pa da lta ba*) and the temporally

³⁹ Cf. Si tu p. 227: *sngon 'jug gi ma ning ga da gnyis ni dngos po bdag dang gzhan gnyis ga la 'jug pa dang / der ma gtogs pa'i dus gsum las da lta ba ston pa'i phyir 'jug go //*. “The neutral prefixes, *g-* and *d-* are applied for both the entities self and other, and they are applied to show the present from among the three times that are not included in that [i.e., self and other].”

⁴⁰ Act-qua-doing and act-qua-thing-done are, respectively, agent-prominent and patient-prominent, and hence included under the rubrics self and other. Tibetan grammarians, whatever their other differences, generally agree upon this inclusion. See AACT, 3-8 and 62, §3. The general strategem of including various verb forms that are “obtained/ gotten [indirectly] via the sense” (*don gyis thob pa*) or “understood [implicitly] via the sense” (*don gyis rtogs par bya*) is certainly not original to *gSer tog*, either—although he seems to me to rely on it more than many other grammarians. We find it already used by *Zha lu lo tsā ba Chos skyong bzang po* to explain how future forms in *par bya* are covered by the first line of *Thon mi*’s verse, even though that line only explicitly mentions “past” and “other”: *Zha lu sum rtags* p. 26: ... *me yis bsregs pa dang bsreg par bya / legs par bsams dang bsam par bya // zhes sogs de ltar bshad pa rnams kyi snga ma snga ma rnams 'das pa'i tshig dang phyi ma phyi ma rnams bya ba la 'jug pa ste / bya ba'i sgra ma sbyar yang don gyis rtogs par bya'o //*. “...When one says ‘burned by fire’ and ‘to be burned by fire,’ ‘well thought out’ and ‘to be thought out well,’ and the other such [pairs of] examples [that we have given], then the first of each [pair] is an expression for the past and the second of each applies to thing-done (*bya ba*). Although the word *bya ba* is not used [by *Thon mi*], it is to be understood [implicitly] via the sense.”

present (*dus kyi da lta ba*) with the same force (*shed mtshungs*).⁴¹ So the applications [of the neutral prefixes *g-*, *d-*] for future thing-done and doing (*bya 'gyur dang byed 'gyur ma 'ongs pa*) and the applications for the temporally future (*dus kyi ma 'ongs pa*), whether they are related or not to a distinct agent (*byed pa po gzhan 'brel yin min*), are [all] gotten through the sense (*don gyis thob pa*) [of the śloka's words].⁴²

§45. When [Thon mi] said, *mo ni bdag dang ma 'ongs phyir* (“The feminine prefix is for self and the future”), *mo* (“feminine”) refers to the letter ‘*a-*’. The word *bdag* (“self”) is for the entity self which is related to a distinct agent,⁴³ while *dang* is conjunctive (*sdud pa*), that is to say, [the prefix ‘*a-*’] is [also] applied for the entity other, whether it is or is not related to a distinct agent,⁴⁴ and for the acts-qua-doing and acts-qua-thing-

⁴¹ I.e., with even weight (*do mnyam*). Cf. chapter VIII, n. 10 on *bya byed kyi sgra phan tshun shed mtshungs pa*.

⁴² gSer tog is following Ngag dbang bstan dar here. The latter had stated (p. 187): *dnegos su ma bstan kyang don gyis thob pa ga da gnyis ma 'ons pa la 'jug pa ni / dper na / gdul bya'i sems can / gzhal bya'i tshad / dbab bya'i char / dbul bya'i rdzas sogs so //*. “Applications of *g-* and *da-* [prefixes] to the future, which were not explicitly shown [in Thon mi's verse] but are obtained through the sense [of the verse's word ‘both [self and other]’], are as follows: the sentient being to be disciplined, the size to be measured, the rain that is to fall (*dbab bya'i char*), the substance to be offered, etc.” bsTan dar's examples are all simple cases of future thing-done (*bya 'gyur ma 'ongs pa*), with the one oddity, viz., *dbab bya'i char* (“rain that is to fall”), where *dbab* is actually the future of the verb ‘*bab*’, a verb that is intransitive and thus does not have a distinct agent. gSer tog goes a bit further than bsTan dar to include, via the sense, not only future thing-done (*bya 'gyur ma 'ongs pa*), like *gdul bya*, but also future doing (*byed 'gyur ma 'ongs pa*), and the temporally future (*dus kyi ma 'ongs pa*)—as an example of these latter two schemata he is no doubt thinking of a periphrastic, active future form such as *gcod par 'gyur* (“... will cut”). It is striking that gSer tog also allowed applications of *g-* and *d-* for some future forms *not* related to a distinct agent. Here he is probably thinking of bsTan dar's example *dbab bya'i char*. In the case of the ‘*a-*’ prefix, there are numerous intransitives (*tha mi dad pa*) with attested future... *par bya* or ...*bya* forms, e.g., ‘*gro bar bya*’ (“... to go”). But attested cases with *g-* or *d-* are rarer. See n. 44 on some grammarians applying the terms “self” and “other” secondarily in the case of some intransitive verbs.

⁴³ Read *byed pa po gzhan 'brel gyi dngos po bdag* instead of the text's *byed pa po gzhan 'brel gyis dngos po bdag*.

⁴⁴ On gSer tog's repeated use of the conjunction *dang* (“and”) to include forms that were not explicitly mentioned by Thon mi, see n. 36. Note that gSer tog recognizes here a *byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel min gyi dngos po gzhan*—an entity other that is *not* related

done which are related with a distinct agent. As for the word *ma 'ongs pa* (“future”), the *śloka* spoke with the same force (*shed mtshungs*) of future things-done and doings, as well as the temporally future (*dus kyi ma 'ongs pa*), whether [these future forms] are related or not to distinct agents. So

with a distinct agent. In §§56-57, too, he makes it clear that he recognizes cases of self and other *not* related to a distinct agent. The point of “self” and “other” being occasionally applied secondarily to intransitives has a complicated history and needs a bit of clarification.

(a) In general, following Si tu, grammarians do *not* apply the categories of self and other to a verb that has no distinct agent and is intransitive. See AACT 5, n. 8. See dNgul chu Dharmabhadra’s *Si tu’i zhal lung* pp. 50-51 (Japanese translation in Inaba 1986, 369; text p. 444): *de yang byed pa po gzhan mi snang zhes pas / dper na / bdag ‘gro’o lta bu’i tshe / ‘gro ba de bya tshig yin kyang / ‘gro bya ‘gro byed gnyis ka bdag yin pas / ‘gro bya las gzhan pa’i ‘gro byed med pas na ‘di la bdag gzhan gyi dbye ba’ang mi byed pa yin no /*. “Now, when [Si tu] says ‘A distinct agent does not appear,’ [he means that] in cases such as ‘I am going,’ although ‘to go’ is a word for a thing-done, that which undergoes [the action of] going (*‘gro bya*) and the goer (*‘gro byed*) are both I, and thus there is no goer distinct from that which undergoes [the action of] going. Therefore, in such a case, the division in terms of self and other (*bdag gzhan gyi dbye ba*) is not made.”

(b) Nonetheless, some nineteenth century grammarians, such as dByangs can Grub pa’i rdo rje (1809-1887), felt that it was necessary to introduce a notion of *bdag don phal ba*, a “secondary sense of self,” such as the *‘gro ba po* (“goer”) who would be the subject of the verb *‘gro ba* (“to go”). This *bdag phal ba* is to be differentiated from *bdag dngos* (“the real self; self properly speaking”). See Tillemans 1991a. See also Müller-Witte 2009, 213 *et seq.* on dByangs can Grub pa’i rdo rje’s exegesis of verse twelve and a few of the quite numerous and different twentieth century positions on *bdag don phal ba*. *gSer tog* would seem to follow the idea of dByangs can Grub pa’i rdo rje, although he does not say so explicitly. See also §§15, 16. In addition, he also introduces *gzhan* forms for intransitives.

(c) In his *rTags ‘jug gi snying po don gsal*, dByangs can Grub pa’i rdo rje introduced his notion of *bdag don phal ba* specifically in connection with the prefix *-a-*, taking it as a qualification to Si tu’s assertion that Thon mi introduced the specifications of the three times to account for cases that are neither self nor other, *viz.*, intransitives. (Cf. chapter XII, §18.) In effect, this assertion of Si tu is qualified as dealing with *bdag gzhan dngos* rather than *bdag gzhan phal ba*. The key passages from *rTags ‘jug gi snying po don gsal* pp. 133-134 are as follows: *des na dus gsum du dbye ba // bdag gzhan dbye bas ma khyab pa // bsdu ba’i don du shes dgos par // gsungs kyang sngon ‘jug ‘a yig skabs // byed las tsam dang ‘brel ba yi // dngos po bdag la’ang ‘jug pa mihong // ... // mo yig ‘a ni ‘chad pa po // ‘chad par byed dang ‘chad par ‘gyur // zhes sogs dngos po bdag dngos dang // ‘gro ba po dang ‘gro bar byed // ces sogs bdag don phal ba dang // ‘khyil*

applications [of 'a-] for present doing and for the temporally present (*dus*

lo zhes sogs da lta dang // 'khyil bar 'gyur sogs ma 'ongs 'jug //. “So, although it is said that one should understand the divisions into the three times to be for including what is not pervaded by self and other, in the context of the prefix 'a- we see that there are also applications for the entity self that is related with a mere action (*byed las tsam*). ... The feminine letter 'a- is applied for the entity self properly speaking (*bdag dngos*), as in 'chad pa po, 'chad par byed, 'chad par 'gyur, and the secondary sense of self (*bdag don phal ba*) as in 'gro ba po and 'gro bar byed, as well as the present, as in 'khyil lo, and the future, as in 'khyil bar 'gyur.”

(d) Finally, to round out our investigation, here is a sample of two contemporary grammarians' opinions on this controversy, those of mKhyen rab 'od gsal (1925-1997) and sKal bzang 'gyur med (?-1990s). First, mKhyen rab 'od gsal 1979, 25-26 cites the first part of the passage from dByangs can Grub pa'i rdo rje (up until 'jug pa mthong) and then argues: *de la tshig skyon dang don skyon gnyis ka yod de / dang po tshig skyon ni / de lta na bzhugs pa po dang / bzhengs pa po sogs sngon 'jug ba yig gi skabs su'ang de ltar 'byung bas / gsungs kyang sngon 'jug 'a yig skabs / zhes 'a yig rkyang pa logs su dgar mi rigs pa dang / gnyis pa don skyon yang yod de / 'di skabs bya byed tha dad pa'i dngos po bdag gzhan gnyis kyi don ni de lta min par bdag gzhan nam / byed po dang las gnyis phan tshun ltos grub kyi tshul du gcig yod na cig shos kyang nges par yod dgos kyang / khyed kyi bdag don phal pa zhes pa ni de lta min par / 'gro ba po dang / 'gro bya gnyis ka de nyid las tha dad du 'jog tu med pas dgos pa cher mi 'dug snyam /*. “Here there are faults concerning the wording [of dByangs can Grub pa'i rdo rje's statement] and faults concerning the sense. First of all, the faults concerning the wording are as follows: In that case, in the context of the *b-* prefix, *bzhugs pa po*, *bzhengs pa po* and the like, would be like that [i.e., they would *also* be *bdag phal ba*], and thus when [dByangs can Grub pa'i rdo rje] says 'Although it is said ... in the context of the prefix 'a-, it would be incorrect to single out just the letter 'a- [here]. Secondly, there are also faults concerning the sense: In the context of [Thon mi's verse], the meaning of 'the entities self and other,' where the object and agent are different, is not like [what dByangs can Grub pa'i rdo rje speaks of]. Self/other, or in other words, agent and object, are interdependently established, so that if one exists the other must also definitely exist, but your *bdag don phal ba* is not like that. Rather the goer ('gro ba po) and that which undergoes the going ('gro bya) are identical and not established as different. So I think that there is no great need [to introduce *bdag don phal ba*].” Second, sKal bzang 'gyur med 1981, 360-361 alludes to the secondary use of the terminology, “self/other,” but stresses its important differences from self/other properly speaking: *bdag shar phyogs 'gro gnam nas char pa 'bab / lta bur cha mtshon na / 'gro ba po bdag yin zer chog kyang de la ltos pa'i 'gro bya gzhan med pa dang / 'bab rgyu char pa yin yang de la ltos pa'i 'bab pa po gzhan gtan nas yod mi srid pa de'i thog nas bya tshig 'gro dang 'bab gnyis bya byed tha*

kyi da lta ba), be they related or not to a distinct agent, were presented through the sense [of the śloka's words].⁴⁵

§46. In the stated root śloka [Thon mi] [just] says, via a broad-termed explanation (*rags bshad*), that the focus or act to be done (*bya ba'i yul lam las*) related with a distinct agent is the entity other, the act-qua-doing (*byed pa'i las*) is the entity self, accomplished thing-done (*bya ba byas pa*) is the past, what one is doing (*byed bzhin*) is present, what is to be done (*bya 'gyur*) and what one will do (*byed 'gyur*) are future. Nevertheless, in [Thon mi's] later six treatises there surely would have been some finely detailed explanation (*zhib bshad*) of such things, i.e., the particular ways one applies the various prefixes to show each individual point, viz., self, other, and the three times, be they related or not with a distinct agent.

mi dad pa yin par gsal por 'phrod pa red / rgyu mtshan de'i dbang gis bya byed tha mi dad pa'i bya tshig de rigs la gong dang mi 'dra bar dngos po bdag gzhan gyi dbye ba med la / de bzhin 'gro ba po bdag dang 'bab rgyu char pa gnyis ka la'ang rnam dbye'i rkyen gang yang sbyar du mi rung / “If one considers [examples] such as ‘I am going to the East’ or ‘Rain is falling from the sky,’ then although one can say that the goer is ‘self’ (*bdag*), there is no ‘other object’ relative to that [goer] which undergoes the going. And although the rain is what is to fall, there can never be an ‘other faller’ relative to that [rain]. Thus, it is clearly ascertained that verbs [such as] ‘to go’ or ‘to fall’ are ones where the object and agent are not different. For this reason, contrary to the previous [type of verb, viz., transitives], the class of verbs where the object and agent are not different does not have any divisions in terms of the entities self and other. Similarly, one cannot join any case-endings [such as the ergative, *kyis*, *gis*, and *gyis*] to the goer, i.e., oneself, and that which is to fall, i.e., the rain.”

⁴⁵ See §44 and our notes to §44. The two passages turn on the same exegetical strategies. Again, there is a close connection with Ngag dbang bstan dar's commentary. bsTan dar, like Si tu, corrects Thon mi'i text to read *mo ni bdag da* [instead of *dang*] *ma 'ongs phyir*. See §42 and our notes. He can therefore unproblematically say that, besides the future, the corrected verse explicitly specifies applications for present forms like *skud pa 'khal bzhin pa*, *gdan la 'khod bzhin pa...* 'jug, 'don, 'thor, 'gog, 'bul, 'tshol, etc. gSer tog, on the other hand, is aware of this amendment (see §42). He himself explains the verse as is but says that it indirectly, or through the sense, applies to the present. Note that there are many intransitives, i.e., verbs without distinct agents, that have present forms with 'a- prefixes. bsTan dar cites *gdan la 'khod bzhin pa* (“...is settled now on the seat”)—gSer tog would no doubt accept this.

However, nowadays the [six later] texts are no longer extant, and hence we must depend upon antique textual sources from the earlier [two] texts.⁴⁶

§47. This explanation is how we comment on the meaning of the [root] text according to our understanding. Thus, whatever I have explained correctly, may later fresh intellects, equally fortunate as me, [152] keep this well in the auspicious knots (*dpal be'u*) of their minds and not lose it to the hands of the thief of forgetfulness.

§48. Suppose we corrected [Thon mi's] text in accordance with the thought of the two commentaries [*viz.*, those of Si tu Paṅ chen and A lag sha Ngag dbang bstan dar]. If we construed it as

pho ni 'das gzhan bsgrub ma 'ongs
ma ning gnyis ka da ma 'ongs
mo ni bdag gzhan da ma 'ongs

“The masculine is [for] the past, other, establishment [i.e., act-qua-thing-done], [and] future;

The neutral [prefixes] are [for] both [self and other], present, future;

The feminine is [for] self, other, present, future.”⁴⁷

there would be universal pervasion (*spyi khyab*) of [all verbal forms] that are or are not related to a distinct agent, and so this would seem to me completely correct.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ I.e., the *Sum cu pa* and *rTags kyi 'jug pa*. There are, indeed, no other texts of Thon mi extant or recorded traces of them. The eight texts of Thon mi are referred to frequently in the *phyi dar* (“second propagation”) period by authors such as Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290-1364), Zha lu lo tsā ba, Si tu and others. It is sometimes even hypothesized, by e.g., Kong sprul Blo gros mtha' yas (1813-1899), that six disappeared during the time of the anti-Buddhist king Glang dar ma (r. circa 838-841). See Verhagen 2001, 325, n. 578-579 for several references. The much maligned Glang dar ma, more likely, had nothing to do with it, and the cliché of Thon mi's lost corpus of six texts may well have never been anything more than a later legend.

⁴⁷ The last line of śloka twelve stays as is. For Ngag dbang bstan dar's position see n. 48 and n. 34. For Si tu's amendments to the verse, see n. 34. See also Tillemans 1988, n. 27; AACT, 18-19.

⁴⁸ gSer tog's discussion in §48-§55 is closely connected with an important passage from Ngag dbang bstan dar. bsTan dar summarizes his own position on p. 188.2-189.3 of his *sum rtags* commentary: *mdor na ba yig ni dus gsum gyi nang nas 'das pa dang ma 'ongs pa gnyis ka dang / bdag gzhan gnyis kyi nang nas gzhan 'phul zhing / da ltar ba*

dang bdag gnyis ka gtan nas mi 'phul lo // ga da gnyis ni dus gsum gyi nang nas da ltar ba dang ma 'ongs pa gnyis ka dang / bdag gzhan gnyis ka 'phul zhing 'das pa mi 'phul / 'a yig ni dus gsum gyi nang nas da ltar ba dang ma 'ongs pa gnyis ka dang bdag gzhan gyi nang nas bdag 'phul zhing 'das pa dang gzhan gnyis ka mi 'phul lo // de'i phyir 'das tshig gi sngon 'jug yin na ba yig yin pas khyab / da ltar ba'i tshig gi sngon 'jug yin na ga da 'a gsum gang rung yin pas khyab / ma 'ongs pa'i tshig gi sngon 'jug la dngos bstan gtso bo'i dbang du byas na 'a yig kho na dang (/) bya ba yul la yod pa'i las la ma 'ongs pa yang yod pa ltar na sngon 'jug bzhi ga 'jug cing / bshad ma thag pa rnam kyang ma yig dang ming rkyang ma the ba'i dbang du byas pa yin zhing / ming rkyang la nges pa med de / dper na / bstod bzhin pa lta bu da ltar ba dang / bstod par 'gyur ro lta bu ma 'ongs pa dang / bsngags pa po lta bu bdag po'i tshig la'ang sngon 'jug ba yig thob pas so / de bzhin du 'a yig gis 'das tshig gtan nas mi 'phul mod mya ngan las 'das pa lta bu'i 'das pa ni ming yin pas skyon med pa'i tshul dang nges mtshon ming rkyang kun la rigs 'gre'o //. “In sum, the letter *ba-* is prefixed [in the following way]: (1) for both the past and the future from among the three times; (2) for other from among self and other; (3) it is never prefixed for the present or for self. *ga-* and *da-* are prefixed for: (1) both the present and the future from among the three tenses; (2) both self and other; (3) they are not prefixed for the past. The letter *'a-* is prefixed for: (1) both the present and the future from among the three times; (2) for self from among self and other; (3) it is not prefixed for the past and other. Thus, if something is a prefix for an expression for the past, it is necessarily the letter *b-*; if something is a prefix for an expression for the present, it is necessarily either *g-*, *d-* or *'a-*. If we based ourselves principally on what [Thon mi] directly taught [in śloka twelve] about the prefixes [used] for future expressions, then there would only be the letter *'a*. [But] just as future does occur amongst acts pertaining to the focus of the action, so all four prefixes [*b-*, *g-*, *d-*, *'a-*] are applied [for the future]. What was just explained, however, was taken from a perspective that excludes the [prefixed] letter *m-* and simple nouns (*ming rkyang*). There is no [such] certainty in the case of simple nouns. This is because we do also get the *b-* prefix in [verbs] like *bstod bzhin pa*, which is present, in *bstod par 'gyur ro*, which is future, and in an agentive expression (*bdag po'i tshig*) like *bsngags pa po*. Similarly, the letter *'a-* is indeed never the prefix of an expression for the past. The [word] *'das pa* (“... has gone past/beyond,” “the past”) in something like *mya ngan las 'das pa* [= *nirvāṇa*] is a noun. So, in all [other] cases of simple nouns (*ming rkyang*), there will be an analogous reasoning [to show] how [our position on the prefixes] is faultless and to demonstrate that it is [in fact] certain.”

bsTan dar is, however, on shaky ground in saying that *'das pa*, in *mya ngang las 'das pa* (“has gone past suffering”), is the noun “the past,” rather than the past stem of the verb *'da' ba* (“go beyond,” “go past”), and hence is *not* a counterexample to his statement that *'a-* prefixed verbs are never past stems. See *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo s.v. 'da' ba*. Other statements of bsTan dar seem doubtful too, notably, his view that *g-*, *d-* are not

§49. Let us explain some example statements, adopting the perspective that these points [i.e., self, other, acts, three times] do not pertain to simple nouns (*ming rkyang*). While the prefix *b-* is applied to show the past, it is not so that all expressions for the past need to be prefixed [by *b-*]. There are many [pasts] such as, for example, *drangs zin* (“... has been pulled”) [and] *mmand tshar* (“...has already been pressed”). Similarly, although [*b-*] is applied for future thing-done (*bya* ‘*gyur ma* ‘*ongs pa*) and the entity other, there are [examples of the entity other without the *b-* prefix], like *drang bya* (“what is to be pulled”) [and] *gsad bya* (“what is to be killed”). And it is not applied for the temporally present (*dus kyi da lta ba*), self, or doing (*byed pa*).

§50. While the prefixes *g-* and *d-* are applied for both the entities self and other, there are cases [of self without *g-* and *d-*] such as ‘*ding byed* (“means of spreading”) and *sel byed* (“means of removing”) and [cases of other] such as *bsam bya* (“what is to be thought”) and *bri bya* (“what is to be written”). And although [*g-*, *d-*] are applied for the present and future, it is easily understood by analogy with the previous [examples] that they are not needed in all cases [of present and future]. And [*g-*, *d-*] cannot possibly be prefixes in expressions for the past.⁴⁹

§51. The prefix ‘*a-*’ is applied for the entity self, but there are cases [of self without ‘*a-*’] such as *dpyod byed* (“means of analyzing”) [and] *stsol byed* (“means of bestowing”). And although it is applied for the present and future, there are [future forms without ‘*a-*’] such as *gding bya* and *myang bya* (“what is to be experienced”). There are no applications [of ‘*a-*’] for the past and the entity other.⁵⁰

prefixes for the past tense. There are some examples of *d-* being applied for the past—e.g., *dpyad pa* (“... has analyzed”), *dpags pa* (“... has reasoned”), and *dpyangs pa* (“... has suspended”). Finally, note that gSer tog will elaborate upon bsTan dar’s idea that simple nouns, like *sngags* and *stod* (“praise,” “eulogy”), can take the *b-* prefix to make present and future verb phrases, like *bstod bzhin pa* and *bstod par* ‘*gyur*, respectively, or agentive expressions like *bsngags pa po* (“praiser”), all seemingly in violation of the first line of verse twelve. See §54 and n. 51 below.

⁴⁹ gSer tog is following bsTan dar here and could also be confronted with relatively rare counterexamples, such as the *d-*-prefixed past stems *dpyad*, *dpags*, and *dpyangs* or the *g-*-prefixed past *gdams* (“... has instructed”). See n. 48.

⁵⁰ Note that in §40 he did, nonetheless, give an ‘*a-*’-prefixed form, i.e., ‘*bud bya*, as an example of the entity other (*dingos po gzhan*). The simplest explanation is that gSer tog again, for better or worse, just reproduced bsTan dar’s position here. See n. 48.

§52. These, then, are the ways that the prefixes are applied for the points directly taught in the [root] text, i.e., the triad actions, agents, and objects, as well as self and other. They also constitute the principal points when it is said, “For what purpose are [the prefixes] applied (*dgos pa ci phyir ‘jug pa’?*)” Thus, here is what we really need to do: with guidance, debate, and so forth, promote understanding that is certain about [matters such as] (a) when one does or does not apply which prefix to which radical (*ming gzhi*) because of thing-done, doing, etc. (*bya byed sogs*) and (b) the meaning and particularities of such applications.

§53. [153] Now, in [A lag sha Ngag dbang] bsTan dar’s commentary, it is said that simple nouns (*ming rkyang*) should not be stated as examples in this context [i.e., when one is interpreting Thon mi’s verse]. However, because he thought that it was important to bring forth the principal certainties about how orthography (*yig sdeb*) differs when prefixes are applied to nouns to [convey] the senses of thing-done, doing, etc., he made a specially penetrating explanation. We should just learn that first.⁵¹

⁵¹ See n. 48 to §48 for a translation of the complete passage from bsTan dar.

(a) gSer tog and bsTan dar’s point is not that prefixes cannot be applied to nouns. It is rather that *when* they are applied, the rules as laid down in verse twelve, or even in the amended version of verse twelve, will not hold strictly. Thus, for example in §54, gSer tog (elaborating upon bsTan dar) tells us that the nouns *sngags* (“praise”) and *stod* (“eulogy”) can take *b-* prefixes to make present verbal forms *bsngags byed* and *bstod byed*. The fact of there being present forms with *b-* would thus seem to run counter to the first line of verse twelve. The verbs *bsngags* and *bstod* are, however, invariable for self, other, and the three times. See the Verb Tables in *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo*, s.v. *bsngags* and *bstod*. An obvious problem in this line of reasoning is that all invariable verbs would, *in any case*, have to be disregarded when giving examples of how Thon mi made differentiations in tense and voice in function of a verb’s *different* prefixes.

(b) Si tu himself had inveighed against early grammarians who cited simple nouns (*ming rkyang*) as examples of the uses of the prefixes. See AACT pp. 10-11. Whereas Ngag dbang bstan dar and gSer tog are dealing with the applications of prefixes to existent nouns to *make* verbs (e.g., *sngags* → *bsngags*), Si tu is arguing against taking nouns like *gcan gzhan* (“carnivore”) as being *themselves* examples of the use of the *g-* prefix to show something about self and other. (The prefix seems to be an integral part of the noun, rather than an addition to **can zan*). We see that, indeed, Si tu must have been exasperated with his predecessors’ confused presentations of examples for self, other, and the three times. Si tu’s *bête noire* here was, no doubt, rNam gling Paṅ chen dKon mchog chos grags (1648-1718), who, in *rNam gling sum rtags*, gives numerous, seemingly arbi-

§54. Let us, therefore, understand correctly how the prefixes are applied to nouns. Whether [the actions] are related or not with a distinct agent, we need to know how the prefixes are also applied to simple nouns in order to show meanings such as thing-done and doing. So I'll briefly say the following.⁵² Now, there are boundless cases of simple noun entities (*ming rkyang gi dngos po*, like *yan lag* (“limb”), *yul* (“place”), *yod* (“existent”), *med* (“nonexistent”), *tshad ma* (“means of knowledge”), *'dra* (“likeness”), *rgyun* (“continuum”), etc., to which one never applies prefixes in order to convey thing-done and doing. Therefore, to take the simple nouns that [can] take prefixes, there are many cases such as *sngags* (“praise”),⁵³ *stod* (“eulogy”), *dor* (“abandonment”), *thob* (“acquisition”). They are, for instance, as follows: (1) [in the case of the nouns *sngags* and *stod*] the orthography [of the resultant stems] does not differ at all [when one adds a prefix to the nouns and shows self, other, the acts, or tenses], as in, for instance, *bsngags bya* (“what is to be praised”) *bsngags byed*, *bsngags zin*, *bsngags shig*, *bstod bya* (“what is to be eulogized”), *bstod byed*, *bstod do*, *bstod cig*; (2) [in the case of *dor* and *thob*], the orthography changes a bit [to show self, other, etc.], as in *dor bya*, *'dor byed*, *dord zin*, *dord cig*, *thob bya*, *'thob byed*, *thob zin*, [and] *thob cig*.

trarily chosen nouns as examples of self, other, and the three times—Si tu characterizes such earlier writers (p. 207) as “obscurantists widely disseminating rash [statements] that have not been [properly] thought out” (*ma brtags pa'i bab col mang du spros pa'i rdzob rnams*). Note that *rNam gling sum rtags* p. 124 gives, *inter alia*, the following examples of *g-* prefixed forms covered by verse twelve: *gcan gzan*, *la gcan pa* (“toll collector for a [mountain] pass”), *gnyug ma'i gshis* (“primordial/innate character”), *gnyug mar gnas* (“abiding in the primordial”), *chu'i gting* (“the depths of the water”), *nor gyi gter* (“mine of jewels”), *gdod nas dag pa* (“original purity”). Cf. Si tu, 207: *ga yig bya ba gzhi la yod pa'i las la 'jug pa'i dper yang / gcan zan / la gcan pa / sgra gcan / rus kyi gnyos / dud 'gro gnyan sogs phal cher ming rkyang kho nar bkod pa /*. “He just presents for the most part simple nouns as examples of the letter *ga-* being applied for acts that belong to the basis of the action, such as ‘carnivore,’ ‘[the demon] Rāhu,’ ‘clan,’ ‘the animal, the [Himalayan] sheep,’ and so forth.” All the examples of simple nouns being self, other, etc. (as well as earlier ones) are found in *rNam gling sum rtags* p. 124. It is difficult *not* to side with Si tu in his righteous exasperation with early grammarians on these points.

⁵² From here on, gSer tog is giving his own views rather than reproducing those of bsTan dar.

⁵³ H. Jäschke's *Tibetan-English Dictionary* gives “praise,” “encomium” as a secondary sense of *sngags*, besides its usual sense of “*mantra*,” “incantation.”

§55. Furthermore, even when no prefix is applied to the noun, there are also many cases which show the meanings of thing-done, doing, and so forth, whether related or not to a distinct agent: for instance [to take the nouns *len pa* “acquisition” and *myong ba* “experience”], the orthography changes completely in, for instance, *blang bya*,⁵⁴ *len byed*, *blangs zin*, *longs shig*, *myang bya*, *myong byed*, *myangs zin*, *myongs shig*; and [to take the nouns *spyod pa* “practice” and *rbod pa* “setting loose”⁵⁵] there are a few changes, like *spyad bya*, *spyod byed*, *spyad zin*, *spyod cig*, *rbad bya*, *rbod byed*, *rbad zin*, *rbod cig*.

§56. Turning now to the extremely feminine prefix, the letter *m-*, its applications for both the entities self and other related to a distinct agent, for act-qua-doing and act-qua-thing-done, and for all three times, were spoken of [directly] in [Thon mi’s] śloka [when the latter said, “the extremely feminine is for all alike” (*shin tu mo ni mnyam phyir ro*)]. So the applications for self, other, and so forth *not* related to a distinct agent⁵⁶ are gotten through the sense, with the result that [*m-*] will be applied to the radical to show all these things alike, i.e., without any differences.

§57. To state some examples of applications [of *m-*] for the entity self:

mkhas pa po (“one who becomes learned”)
mthol ba po (“one who confesses”).

Applications [of *m-*] for the entity other:

mkhas bya’i gnas (“an area in which one is to become learned”)
mthol bya’i tshig (“the words to be confessed”).

Applications for doing (*byed pa*):

mkhas par byed (“... makes [someone] learned”)⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Note that the *b-* is not a prefix here but rather a superscribed letter.

⁵⁵ *rbod pa* is at most an educated guess on my part. In §55 (contrary to §54) *gSer tog* doesn’t tell us which nouns he is thinking of.

⁵⁶ On applications of the terminology “self” and “other” to intransitive verbs, i.e., those that do not have a distinct agent, see n. 42 and 44.

⁵⁷ *mkhas* is intransitive (*tha mi dad pa*; *byed med las tshig*), while *mthol* is transitive. Note that *mkhas* does, nonetheless, figure in phrases with *bya* and *byed*—*gSer tog* clearly

mkhas byed (“means of becoming learned”, “means of making learned”)
mkhas (“... is learned”)
mthol bar byed (“... confesses”)
mthol byed (“means of confessing”)
mthol (“... confesses”).

Applications [of *m-*] for the focus of the action or the act-qua-thing-done:⁵⁸

mkhas par bya (“... is to become learned”, “... is to be made learned”)
mkhas bya (“that in which one is to become learned”)
mkhas (“... will/should be learned”)
mthol bar bya (“... is to be confessed”)
mthol bya (“what is to be confessed”)
mthol (“... will/should be confessed”)[155].

Applications [of *m-*] for past accomplished [action]:

mkhas par byas (“... has become learned”)
mkhas zin (“... has become learned”)
mkhas (“... has become learned”)
mthold par byas, mthold zin, mthold (“... has confessed,” “... has been confessed”).

Applications specially (*dmigs kyis*) for doing (*byed pa*) or the temporally present (*dus kyid dus da lta ba*):

mkhas kyin (“... is becoming learned”)
mthol gyin (“... is confessing”).

does not shy away from using the terminology of “self” and “other” in this case, although presumably in the secondary (*phal ba*), rather than actual (*dnegos*), sense. See n. 44. In the case of involuntary verbs (*bya tshig gzhan dbang can*), like *mkhas pa*, however, the form in ... *par byed* typically has a causative sense. Cf. *gnyid nyal bar byed* (“... he puts him to sleep”).

⁵⁸ Here it seems that we must read the word *las* in *bya ba'i yul lam las la 'jug pa* as also going with the word *bya ba'i*, so that the *las* is the act-qua-thing-done, i.e., *bya ba'i las*. Certainly, half of the examples are of act-qua-thing-done (*bya ba'i las*), and gSer tog's own description of the uses of *m-* (see §56) would demand that he also give examples of act-qua-thing-done if he is to give examples of all the uses.

Applications specially for the temporally future (*dus kyi dus ma 'ongs pa*):

mkhas par 'gyur (“... will be learned”)
mthol bar 'gyur (“... will confess”).

§58. The fact that applications for imperatives (*bskul tshig*), which are included in act-qua-doing (*byed las*), were not directly spoken about in the root [text] was because prefixes do not apply in the case of imperatives.⁵⁹ Nonetheless, earlier commentators did make it clear that [imperatives] belonged to the initial stream of teaching [i.e., that of the *rTags kyi 'jug pa*]. To take some examples:

snod khongs shig (“Fill the vessel!”)
chu khog cig (“Stop the water!”)
me tog thord cig (“Scatter the flowers!”).

And there are also applications to nouns (*ming 'jug pa*):

rten la mjold cig (“Look at the statue!”)
tshad 'jold cig (“Measure the size!”).⁶⁰[156]

There is no difference in the imperative whether it takes *cig*, *zhig* [or] *shig*, but [imperatives] like *phye shig* (“Divide!”) do appear on occasion in correct textual sources (*dpe khungs dag pa*). Thus, it seems that for expressing an imperative, using *shig* has greater power (*nus pa che ba*) than *zhig*.⁶¹

⁵⁹ A kya Yongs 'dzin had the view that imperatives showed act-qua-doing. For him “the present and the imperative belong to act-qua-doing” (*da lta ba dang bskul tshig gnyis byed pa 'i las su gtogs la*). It seems gSer tog does likewise. See AACT, p. 54, §21. gSer tog’s statement in §58 that prefixes do not apply in the case of imperatives might be taken as representing the statistical majority, but it admits of several important exceptions. Ironically, the examples he gives later are precisely such exceptions: *mjold* is an *m*-prefixed imperative of *mjal* (present, past, future), while *'jold* is the *'a*-prefixed imperative of *'jal* (present), *gzhal* (future), *bcal* (past).

⁶⁰ The nouns are presumably *mjal* (*kha*) and *'jal* (*kha*).

⁶¹ When gSer tog says there is “no difference in the imperative,” he means that whether we add *cig*, *zhig*, or *shig*, the verbal form remains an imperative and conveys a command. Following the usual rules, *cig* is added after final *g*, *d*, *b*, and *da drag*; *zhig* is added after final *ng*, *n*, *m*, *'a*, *r*, *l*, and the absence of a final consonant (*mtha 'med*); *shig* is only

Tibetan text

§1. [137] bzhi pa dgos pa ci yi phyir du ‘jug par byed pa la gnyis / bya byed [138] las gsum sogs kyi don mdo tsam bshad pa / ci phyir ‘jug tshul dngos bshad pa’o //

§2. dang po ni / bya byed las gsum dang bdag gzhan dang ‘das ma ‘ongs da lta ba zhes pa’i don rnams la blo kha legs par ma phyogs phyin *rTags kyi ‘jug pa’i* don dpyis phyin par mi go ba’i phyir cung zad bshad na / bya byed las gsum du phye ba’i don la / byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ma ‘brel gyi dbang gis khyad par mi ‘dra ba cung zad re yod mod / gtso cher byed pa po las su bya ba gang bya rgyu de bgyi ba la bya ba dang / bya ba de byed pa po gtso bo dang byed pa phal ba gnyis la byed pa dang / las gang bya ba’i yul la las zhes bya’o //

§3. de yang dper brjod kyi steng nas bshad na /

phyug por ‘gro ba’i ched du dbul pos ‘bad pas nor btsal /

zhes brjod pa’i tshe / phyug por ‘gro ba de bya ba’i yul yin zhing / dbul po ni byed pa po gtso bo dang / ‘bad pa ni byed pa phal ba dang / nor ni las dngos dang / btsal ba ni bya ba dngos yin no //

§4. dbang bskur ba’i ched du lag pas bum pa ‘dzin /

ces pa’i tshe / dbang bskur ba bya ba’i yul / lag pa byed pa / bum pa las / ‘dzin pa bya ba yin zhing /

§5. khrus kyi phyir bum pa gzung bar bya /

zhes pa’i tshe / khrus bya ba’i yul / bum pa las / gzung ba bya ba / byed pa shugs las rtogs dgos pa dang /

§6. bum pa ‘dzin par byed /

ces pa’i tshe / bum pa las / ‘dzin pa bya ba / byed ces pas byed pa ston pa lta bu’o //

after final *s*. Cf. *Dag yig gsar bsgrigs*, p. 879. Clearly a case such as *phye shig*, where *phye* ends in a vowel, would be anomalous by these rules. gSer tog, however, (perhaps unconvincingly) hypothesizes that it *is* correct and represents a stronger imperative than the more usual *phye zhig*.

§7. bdag gzhan gnyis su phye ba'i don la / 'di'i skabs kyi bdag dang gzhan zhes pa ni / spyir bdag gzhan gnyis su phye ba'i bdag dang gzhan tsam la go bar mi bya bar / las gang gi byed pa po dang byed pa dang byed pa'i las la bdag ces pa dang / gang bya ba'i yul dang bya ba dang bya ba'i las [139] la gzhan zhes bya ba'o //

§8. de yang dbul pos 'bad pas nor btsal ba na / nor 'tshol bzhin pa'i las ni / skabs 'di'i las la bya rgyu'i las dang byed bzhin pa'i las gnyis yod pa las / byed bzhin pa'i las yin pas / de la bdag gzhan gnyis kyi nang nas dngos po bdag ces pa dang / byed pa po la yod pa'i las dang / da lta ba'i las dang / 'tshol bar byed pa'i las zhes bya ba yin la / nor 'tshol ba na rnyed pa de bya rgyu'i las yin pas / de la bdag gzhan gnyis kyi nang nas dngos po gzhan zhes pa dang / bya ba yul la yod pa'i las dang / bya 'gyur ma 'ongs pa'i las dang / btsal bya'i las zhes bya ba yin no // des na byed pa po la yod pa'i las dang / bya ba yul la yod pa'i las gnyis la bdag dang gzhan zhes pa'i don thob pa yin par shes dgos so //

§9. de dag gi don bsdu na / dngos po dang / las gnyis su 'dus pa yin te / dngos po la ni / dngos po bdag dang / dngos po gzhan dang las kyi dngos po gsum yod de / dbul po dang / des 'bad pa gnyis ni / bdag gzhan gnyis las dngos po bdag dang / bya byed las gsum las byed pa zhes bya zhing / btsal bya'i nor ni / bya ba bsgrub pa'i yul yin pas bdag gzhan gnyis las dngos po gzhan dang / bya byed las gsum las las kyi dngos po zhes bya la / nor btsal ba'i bya ba ni / gang bya ba'i dngos po yin pas bdag gzhan gnyis las dngos po gzhan zhes bya'o //

§10. las la ni byed pa'i las dang / bya ba'i las gnyis yod de / dbul pos 'bad pas nor 'tshol ba ni / byed pa po dbul po dang 'brel ba'i las yin pas byed pa'i las zhes bya la / 'bad pas nor 'tshol ba'i bya ba ni / 'bad pa dang 'brel nas ngo bo gcig tu yod pas byed pa po dang 'brel ba'i las dang / bdag dang 'brel ba'i las zhes bya zhing / nor btsal nas rnyed pa'i cha ni / bya ba'i yul nor dang 'brel ba'i las yin pas bya ba'i las dang / gzhan dang 'brel ba'i las zhes bya'o // [140]

§11. bya ba la yang gnyis yod de / nor 'bad pas btsal ba'i rtsol ba ni / byed pa po dbul po la yod pas byed pa po la yod pa'i bya ba zhes bya la / btsald zin rnyed pa ni / bya yul nor gyi steng du yod pas bya ba yul la yod pa'i bya ba zhes bya ba yin no //

§12. dus gsum du phye ba'i don la / nor btsal bya'i las ni / bya 'gyur dang / 'tshol ba'i las ni / byed 'gyur yin pas ma 'ongs pa dang / nor 'tshol bzhin pa'i las ni / byed bzhin yin pas da lta ba dang / btsald zin phyug por song ba ni / bya ba byas zin yin pas 'das pa zhes bya zhing / nor tshold cig ces pa ni / byed las su gtogs pa'i bskul tshig yin pas ma 'ongs pa zhes bya'o //

§13. ‘on kyang bya byed las kyi dus gsum dang / spyir dus gsum gyi
‘jog tshul la khyad par cung zad re yod de / dper na /

gdul bya’i sems can /

zhes pa lta bu la mtshon na / las sgra de yi ‘jug yul rnam pa gsum du yod
de / gdul bya zhes pa las sgra dngos ma ‘ongs pa dang / sems can ni las
/ ‘dul ba ni byed pa da lta ba / btuld pa ni byas zin ‘das pa / gdul bar bya
zhes pa ni bya ba’i las ma ‘ongs pa zhes bya zhing / sems can de gdul ba’i
bya bas slar ‘dul dgos pa ni / dus kyi dus ma ‘ongs pa dang / ‘dul bzhin pa
ni / dus kyi dus da lta ba dang / btuld zin pa ni / dus kyi dus ‘das pa’i don
yin par go dgos so //

§14. ‘dir byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ma ‘brel zhes pa’i don ni / las
dang bya ba gang zhig byed pa po gzhan gyis dngos su sgrub par byed pa
zhig yin na / de la byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i las zhes bya ste / dper
brjod na / gser ‘gyur rtsi yis lcags gser du bsgyur ba / lta bu la /

gser du bsgyur bya’i lcags /

sgyur pa po /

gser du sgyur bar byed /

gser du bsgyurd zin /

gser du sgyurd cig /

ces pa dang /

gnas nas dbyung bya’i gte po /

‘byin pa po /

gnas nas ‘byin par byed /

gnas nas phyung zin /

gnas nas phyungs shig /

ces pa lta bu bya byed kyi dbang gis yig gzugs mi ‘dra ba thob tshul dang /

§15. las dang bya ba gang zhig byed pa po gzhan dngos su med par
rang gi ngang gis ‘grub par snang ba lta bu yin na / de la byed pa po gzhan
dang ma ‘brel ba’i las zhes bya ste / dper brjod na / skyes bu zhig gi mdun
du lcags gong ril ril ba zhig glo bur du rang gi ngang gis gser du ‘gyur ba
/ lta bu la /

gser du ‘gyur bya’i lcags /

gser du ‘gyur bzhin pa /

gser du gyurd zin /
gser du 'gyur zhig /

ces pa dang /

gnas nas 'byung bya'i dge slong /
gnas nas 'byung bzhin pa /
gnas nas byung zin /
gnas nas 'byung zhig /

ces pa lta bu bya byed las kyi rnam gzhas thob kyang de'i dbang gis yig
gzugs mi 'gyur bar don thob kyi yig gzugs mi 'dra ba thob tshul te gnyis
yod do //

§16. de la lcags rang nyid gser du 'gyur ba'i tshe / lcags rang gi 'byung
ba rnam kyi⁶² byed pas [142] yin yang rang gi 'byung ba las byed pa po
gzhan gyis min pa ste / skyes bu de'i bsod nams kyi byed pas kyang yin
mod byed pa po lta bu'i bsod nams nyid gzhan yin yang dngos su mi snang
ba'i phyir dang / gnas nas 'byin pa po med par dge slong zhig rang nyid
gnas nas 'byung ba'i tshe / rang nyid byed pa po tsam las byed pa po gzhan
dngos su med pa lta bu la legs par dpyad na / bya byed las gsum dang byed
pa po gzhan dang 'brel ma 'brel dang bdag gzhan gyi don la nges pa 'khrul
med skye bar 'gyur ro //

§17. gzhan yang skyes bu'i rtsol ba la dngos su ltos kyang mtha' nas
nang du bsdu ba lta bu la /

bsdu bya /
sdud pa po /
sdud byed /
sdud bzhin /
bsdus zin /
sdud par 'gyur /
sdus shig /

ces pa dang / thor bu phyogs gcig tu sdud pa lta bu la /

btu bya /

⁶² Ego kyi: Text kyis. See chapter XII, n. 16.

sdud pa po /
 sdud par byed /
 sdud bzhin /
 btus zin /
 sdud par 'gyur /
 sdud cig /

ces pa lta bus mtshon pa'i yig gzugs mi 'dra ba thob tshul mang du yod pas zhib cing mtha' chod par bslab sbyor byed pa gal che'o //

§18. gzhung 'dir byed pa po dang bya ba'i yul gyi sgra rnams bsdu ba'i ched du bdag gzhan gyi dbye ba mdzad cing / de la byed bzhin da lta ba dang / bya 'gyur dang byed 'gyur ma 'ongs pa dang / bya ba byas zin 'das pa yod pa dang / bdag gzhan gyi dbye bas ma khyab pa rnams kyang bsdu ba'i ched du dus gsum gyi dbye ba mdzad pa yin no //

§19. des na dus gsum gyi dbye bas ni byed las dang 'brel ba'i ngag gi sbyor ba thams cad la khyab cing / bdag gzhan gyi dbye bas ni de tsam du khyab pa min pa'i tshul dang / byed las dang 'brel ba'i bya byed kyi tshig phan tshun shed mthungs rnams kyang bdag gzhan gyi dbye bar bsdu ba'i tshul sogs kyi khyad par phyed shes dgos pa ni skabs 'dir med mi rung ba yin no //

§20. gnyis pa ci phyir 'jug pa dngos bshad pa ni / sngon 'jug rnams ming gzhi'i yi ge rnams la dgos pa ci zhis gi don ston pa'i phyir du 'jug par byed ce na brjod par bya ste / sngon 'jug gi yi ge lnga las pho ba yig ni / dus gsum gyi nang nas byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel ba'i bya ba'i [143] las byas zin 'das pa ston pa'i phyir du 'jug pa yin te / dper brjod na /

snod bkang /
 chu rgyun bkag /

ces dang /

bkang /
 bkag /

ces pa lta bu'o //

§21. dang sgra'i nus pas byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel ba'i bya 'gyur ram bya las ma 'ongs pa la 'jug pa yin te / dper brjod na /

bklag par bya /

bklag bya /
 bklag /
 bskor bar bya /
 bskor bya /
 bskor /

zhes pa lta bu dang /

§22. bdag gzhan gnyis kyi nang nas dngos po gzhan te byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i gang bya ba’i yul la ‘jug pa yin te / dper brjod na /

bzhog bya’i shing /
 bskul bya’i chos /

zhes pa lta bu dang /

§23. bya byed las gsum gyi nang nas byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i bya ba’i las bsgrub par bya ba’i phyir du ‘jug pa yin te / dper brjod na /

nor brku bar bya /
 gzugs blta bar bya /
 brku bya /
 blta bya /
 brku /
 blta /

zhes pa lta bu’o //

§24. gzhan yang / brjod bya / brjod zin / bshad bya / bshad zin lta bu bya ba yul gyi sgra dang byas zin ‘das pa gnyis yig gzugs gcig gis ston pa dang / bcib pa / bza’ ba lta bu bya tshig gis gsal mi dgos par dngos po gzhan la ‘jug pa dang / ‘chad ‘gyur ma ning gi skabs su / gzung ba / gzhal ba lta bu bya tshig med kyang yul gyi sgra ston pa dang /

§25. brgyan par bya / bskor bar bya lta bu dngos po gzhan la da drag mi thob pas slar bsdu’am bya tshig [144] gi tshig sna bsdu tshe / brgyan no / bskor ro zhes thob pa las / brgyan to sogs mi thob pa dang / btsald bya lta bu da drag gtan du ‘jug pa yin yang da drag ni bya yul dang ‘das pa thun mong du ston pa mi srid pas dngos po gzhan la don gyis thob kyang btsal bya zhes yig gzugs la da drag ‘dor dgos pas / gzhan nam bya ba’i yul la da drag mi thob pa dang / ‘chad ‘gyur ma ning dang mo’i skabs su / ‘dzind / gsold lta bu dngos po bdag la da drag ‘jug kyang / slar bsdu’am tshig sna bsdu tshe / ‘dzin no / gsol lo lta bu da drag dor ba ni byed pa da lta ba gsal

byed dang / 'dzind to / gsold to lta bu da drag thob pa yang byed pa zin
pa'i nyams dod pa rnams so sor 'byed shes dgos shing /

§26. bshad pa dang 'chad 'gyur skabs su /

bsten par bya /

bsten bya /

bsten /

gtang bar bya /

gtang bya /

gtang /

dpyad par bya /

dpyad bya /

dpyad /

mchod par bya /

mchod bya /

mchod

lta bu las sam bya las ma 'ongs pa'am dngos po gzhan la 'jug pa dang /

§27. sten pa po /

sten par byed /

sten byed /

sten /

gtong ba po / gtong bar byed / gtong byed / gtong /

dpyod pa po / dpyod par byed / dpyod byed / dpyod /

mchod pa po / mchod par byed / mchod byed / mchod

lta bu dngos po bdag gam byed pa la 'jug pa dang /

§28. bstend par byas /

bstend zin /

bstend /

btang bar byas / btang zin / btang /

dpyad par byas / dpyad zin / dpyad /

mchod par byas / mchod zin / mchod

lta bu bya ba byas zin dang dus kyi dus 'das pa dang /

sten /

gtong / dpyod / mchod

lta bu byed bzhin dang dus kyi dus da lta ba dang /

bsten /
gtang / dpyad / mchod

lta bu bya ‘gyur dang dus kyi dus ma ‘ongs pa rnam thun mong du ston
pa yin zhing /

§29. ‘dir bstan bdag gzhan gyi dbye bas ma khyab pa’i dus gsum las /

grub /
‘dus /
byung / [145]

lta bu ‘das pa dang /

‘grub bzhin /
‘grub /
‘du bzhin /
‘du /
‘byung bzhin /
‘byung

lta bu da lta ba dang /

‘grub par ‘gyur
‘grub ‘gyur /
‘grub /
‘du bar ‘gyur / ‘du ‘gyur / ‘du /
‘byung bar ‘gyur / ‘byung ‘gyur / ‘byung

lta bu ma ‘ongs pa la ‘jug pa rnam te / de dag la tshig sna bsdu ma bsdu
gang byas kyang yig gzugs gcig pa thob pa rnam ni so so’i bab dang snga
phyi’i tshig gi nus pa la dpags te shes dgos pa sogs mang du yod kyang /
mtha’ dag par bri bar ma langs shing shog snag gron pa las dgos pa lhag po
med pa’i phyr / rnag smin pa rtol ran pa / shing tog smin pa za ran pa lta
bu phyis ‘byung gi gdul bya skal ldan rnam yod na rnam par dpyod pa’i
sgo dod pa tsam lags so //

§30. **bsTan dar pa**’i ‘grel bar / ras de sang nyin bkru bar bya / yi ge
de da dung bklag par bya’o zhes pa lta bu ma ‘ongs pa la ‘jug pa yod par

gsungs pa ni bam bshad nam snyam ste / dper brjod dngos bstan ltar na sang nyin dang da dung zhes pa'i tshig gis dus kyi dus ma 'ongs pa bstan gyi / bkru bar bya dang bklag par bya zhes pa bya las ma 'ongs pa nyid las ma 'das pa'o //

§31. spyir yang bya ba gzhi la yod pa'i las la / bklag bya lta bu bya las ma 'ongs pa dang dus kyi ma 'ongs pa dang las kyi sgra dngos la'ang 'jug cing / bklags zin lta bu dus kyi dus 'das pa dang bya ba byas zin 'das pa gnyis ni bya ba'i gzhi dang 'brel ba dang / klog par byed lta bu byed pa'i las dang byed bzhin da lta ba dang dus da lta ba ni byed pa po dang 'brel ba yin no //

§32. sngon 'jug gi ma ning ga da ni / ming gzhi la byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel ba'i bdag gzhan gnyis las⁶³ gang byed pa po dngos po bdag dang de 'brel gyi byed pa'i las dang / gang bya ba'i dngos po gzhan dang de 'brel gyi bya ba gnyis ka la 'jug pa yin te / ga yig dngos po bdag la 'jug pa dper brjod na /

khrims gcod pa po /
sbyin pa gtong ba po /

zhes pa dang / bdag 'brel gyi byed pa la 'jug pa / [146]

gcod par byed /
gcod byed /
gcod /
gtong bar byed /
gtong byed /
gtong /

zhes pa dang / dngos po gzhan la 'jug pa /

gcad bya'i shing /
gtang bya'i nor /

zhes pa dang / bya ba la 'jug pa /

⁶³ Ego ming gzhi la byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel ba'i bdag gzhan gnyis las. Text reads ming gzhi la byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel ba'i las. See chapter XII, n. 26.

gcad par bya /
 gcad bya /
 gcad /
 gtang bar bya /
 gtang bya /
 gtang /

zhes pa lta bu dang /

§33. da yig dngos po bdag la ‘jug pa dper brjod na /

gting dpog pa po /
 dka’ gnas dpyod pa po /

zhes pa dang / de ‘brel gyi byed pa la ‘jug pa /

dpog par byed /
 dpog byed / [147]
 dpog /
 dpyod par byed /
 dpyod byed /
 dpyod /

ces pa dang / dngos po gzhan la ‘jug pa /

dpag bya’i lkog gyur /
 dpyad bya’i don /

zhes pa dang / de ‘brel gyi bya ba la ‘jug pa /

dpag par bya /
 dpag bya /
 dpag /
 dpyad par bya /
 dpyad bya /
 dpyad /

ces pa lta bu’o //

§34. byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i dus gsum las da lta ba gtso bor
 ston pa’i ched du ‘jug ste / ga yig da lta ba la ‘jug pa dper brjod na /

shing gcod /
 sbyin pa gtong /
 ‘og tu gnon /
 sman gdu /

zhes pa lta bu dang / da yig da lta ba la ‘jug pa dper brjod na /

rig pas dpyod kyin / [148]
 zho dkrog gin /
 logs su dgar gyin /
 skud pas dkri yin ‘dug /

ces pa lta bu’o //

§35. ma ning dang ‘chad ‘gyur mo dang shin tu mo rnams kyis skabs su shes par bya rgyu zhig yod de / gcad bya / gcod byed / dpag bya / dpog byed ces pa lta bu ga da gnyis yig gzugs mi ‘dra bas bdag gzhan gnyis car la ‘jug pa na / bya byed kyis tshig dang tshig grogs ma sbyar yang / des bya las ma ‘ongs pa dang byed pa da lta ba yin par go nus mod kyang / gtsub bya / gtsub byed / dkri bya / dkri byed ces pa lta bu ga da gnyis yig gzugs gcig gis bdag gzhan gnyis ka la ‘jug pa’i tshe / byed tshig gis ma gsal ba rnams la / gtsub kyin / dkri yin lta bu tshig grogs kyin gin gyin yin bzhi bo las gang rung sbyar bas byed pa da lta ba ston tshul gcig dang / ga da gnyis yig gzugs gcig gis bdag gzhan gnyis ka la ‘jug pa na / dmigs kyis dus la ‘jug pa’i tshe / gtsub kyin / dkri yin lta bu dus kyis dus da lta ba dang / gtsub par ‘gyur / dkri bar ‘gyur lta bu tshig grogs sbyar bas dus kyis dus ma ‘ongs pa gsal bar ston pa’i tshul gcig ste tshul gnyis yod pa’i gnad kyis / rtsa gzhung ‘dir bdag gzhan dang dus gsum so sor gsungs dgos byung ba yin no //

§36. Si tu’i ‘grel bar yang / bshad ma thag pa’i bdag gzhan gnyis po der mi gtogs pa’i dus da lta ba la ‘jug par gsungs pa / gzhung du dus gsum gyi ‘jug pa gsungs pa’i don dang ‘byor bas legs bshad mchog tu bdag ‘khums so //

§37. de’i tshig grogs la ‘grel bshad mang por / gtsub bzhin / dkri bzhin zhes sbyar ba yod kyang / skabs ‘di’i tshig grogs zhes pa mdza’ bshes bsdebs pa lta bu ma yin par / tshig gi phrad nus pa can sbyor ba’i don yin pas kyin sogs bzhi da lta ba dang ‘gyur ma ‘ongs pa’i grogs su sbyar gyi / bzhin sgra ni rang nyid da lta ba ston pa sogs don du mar ‘jug pas tshig gi grogs su mi [149] ‘gyur ram snyam mo //

§38. bdag gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i bya byed las kyi sgra rnams da lta ba yin par mkhas pa mang pos bzhed pa ni / sta res shing gcod pa’i tshe gcod pa’i bya ba byed bzhin yin pas byed pa’i las dang / shing dum bur ‘gro bzhin pa de la bya ba’i las zhes btags pa yin pas da lta bar bzhag pa yin zhing / **Zha lu lo chen** gyis bya ba’i las ma ‘ongs par gsungs pa bya ‘gyur ma ‘ongs pa la dgongs pa yin no //

§39. sngon ‘jug gi mo ‘a yig ni / ming gzhi la byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i bdag gzhan gnyis las dngos po bdag dang / byed pa’i las la ‘jug ste / dngos po bdag la ‘jug pa / dper brjod na /

grub mtha’ ‘gog pa po /
gnas su ‘jog pa po /

zhes pa dang / byed las la ‘jug pa /

‘gog par byed /
‘gog byed /
‘gog /
‘jog par byed /
‘jog byed /
‘jog /

ces pa lta bu’o //

§40. dang sgra’i nus pas byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i dngos po gzhan la’ang ‘jug ste / dper brjod na /

‘khod par bya /
‘khod bya /
‘khod /
‘bud par bya / [150]
‘bud bya /
‘bud /

ces pa lta bu’o //

§41. byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i dus gsum gyi nang nas dus ma ‘ongs pa dang / de ‘brel yin min gyi bya ‘gyur dang byed ‘gyur ma ‘ongs pa ston pa’i phyir du ‘jug ste / dus kyi dus ma ‘ongs pa la ‘jug pa dper brjod na /

‘thab par ‘gyur /
 ‘khod par ‘gyur /

zhes pa dang / bya ba’i las la ‘jug pa /

‘thab par bya /
 ‘thab bya /
 ‘thab /
 ‘khod par bya /
 ‘khod bya /
 ‘khod /

ces pa lta bu’o //

§42. **Si tu Paṅ chen dang bsTan dar lha rams pa’i** ‘grel bar / mo ni bdag da ma ‘ongs phyir / zhes rtsa tshig gi sdeb bcos nas gsungs pa blo dman rnam go sla phyir dgongs dag par snang yang / gzhung tshig gi don slar yang bsdus te bshad na / pho ni ‘das dang gzhan bsgrub phyir // zhes pa’i ‘das zhes pa ni / dus kyi ‘das pa’ang yod mod bye brag tu byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i bya ba byas zin pa bstan cing / dang ni tshigs bead kha skong tsam ma yin par sdud pa’i don te / dus ‘das pa’am byas zin tu ma zad bya ‘gyur ma ‘ongs pa la’ang ‘jug ces pa’o //

§43. gzhan zhes pa ni / byed po gzhan ‘brel gyi gang bya ba’i dngos po gzhan la ‘jug cing / bsgrub [151] ces pa ni bya ba’i las bsgrub pa la ‘jug pa yin zhes pa ste / pho ba yig ni / bya byed las gsum las bya ba’i yul lam las / bdag gzhan gnyis las dngos po gzhan / dus gsum las byas zin ‘das pa gtso bor ston pa la ‘jug go //

§44. ma ning gnyis ka da lta rched // ces pa’i ma ning ni ga da gnyis dang / gnyis ka zhes pa ni / byed po gzhan ‘brel gyi dngos po bdag dang gzhan gnyis la ‘jug pa tshig gi zin pas / bya byed las gsum nang nas bdag ‘brel gyi byed pa’i las dang / gzhan ‘brel gyi bya ba’am las la ‘jug pa don gyis thob cing / da lta zhes pa ni / byed po gzhan ‘brel gyi dus gsum las byed pa da lta ba dang dus kyi da lta ba gnyis shed mtshungs su bstan nas / byed po gzhan ‘brel yin min gyi bya ‘gyur dang byed ‘gyur ma ‘ongs pa dang / dus kyi ma ‘ongs pa la ‘jug pa don gyis thob pa yin no //

§45. mo ni bdag dang ma ‘ongs phyir // zhes pa’i mo ni ‘a yig dang / bdag ces pa ni / byed po gzhan ‘brel gyi⁶⁴ dngos po bdag dang / dang ni sdud pa ste byed po gzhan ‘brel yin min gyi dngos po gzhan dang / byed po gzhan ‘brel gyi byed pa’i las dang bya ba’i las la ‘jug cing / ma ‘ongs zhes pa ni / byed po gzhan ‘brel yin min gyi bya ‘gyur dang byed ‘gyur ma ‘ongs pa dang dus kyī ma ‘ongs pa gnyis shed mtshungs su tshig gis zin pas / byed po gzhan dang ‘brel ma ‘brel gyi byed pa da lta ba dang dus kyī da lta ba la ‘jug pa don gyis bstan pa yin no //

§46. rtsa ba’i tshig zin la byed po gzhan ‘brel gyi bya ba’i yul lam las la dngos po gzhan dang / byed pa’i las la dngos po bdag dang / bya ba byas pa ‘das pa dang / byed bzhin da lta ba dang / bya ‘gyur dang byed ‘gyur ma ‘ongs pa zhes rags bshad kyis gsungs kyang / de’i zhib bshad byed po gzhan ‘brel yin min gyi bdag gzhan dang dus gsum so so’i don ston pa la sngon ‘jug rnam ji ltar ‘jug tshul khyad par dang bcas pa / bstan bcos phyi ma drug tu yod nges yin yang deng sang dpe rgyun mi bzhugs pas sngon gyi dpe rnying khungs dag la brten dgos so //

§47. bshad pa ‘di ni kho bo’i go yul gyi gzhung don ‘grel tshul yin pas bshad pa don mthun du yod phyin rang dang skal mnyam gyi phyis ‘byung [152] blo gsar rnam sems kyī dpal be’ur legs par chongs la brjed ngas kyī rkun po’i lag tu ma shor ba gyis shig //

§48. ‘grel ba gnyis kyī dgongs bzhed ltar sdeb bcas na /

pho ni ‘das gzhan bsgrub ma ‘ongs //
ma ning gnyis ka da ma ‘ongs //
mo ni bdag gzhan da ma ‘ongs //

zhes sbyar na byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ma ‘brel spyi khyab la shin tu rung bar snang ngo //

§49. dper brjod de dag gi don ming rkyang ma the ba’i dbang du byas te bshad na / sngon ‘jug ba yig ni / ‘das pa ston pa la ‘jug kyang / ‘das tshig yin tshad ‘phul mi dgos te / dper na / drangs zin / mnand tshar lta bu mang po yod do // de bzhin du bya ‘gyur ma ‘ongs pa dang dngos po gzhan la ‘jug kyang / drang bya / gsad bya lta bu yod la / dus kyī da lta ba dang bdag dang byed pa la ‘jug pa ma yin no //

⁶⁴ Ego gyi: Text has gyis.

§50. sngon 'jug ga dang da yig ni / dngos po bdag gzhan gnyis ka la 'jug kyang / 'ding byed / sel byed ces pa dang / bsam bya / bri bya lta bu dang / da lta ba dang ma 'ongs pa la 'jug kyang yin tshad la mi dgos pa sngar gyi rigs 'gres shes sla zhing / 'das tshig 'phul ba mi srid do //

§51. sngon 'jug 'a yig ni / dngos po bdag la 'jug kyang / dpyod byed / stsol byed lta bu dang / da lta ba dang ma 'ongs la 'jug kyang / gding bya / myang bya lta bu yod la / 'das pa dang dngos po gzhan la 'jug pa med do //

§52. de rnams ni gzhung gi dngos bstan gyi bya byed las gsum dang bdag gzhan sogs kyi don la sngon 'jug rnams 'jug tshul yin zhing / dgos pa ci phyir 'jug pa gsungs pa'i don gyi gtso bo yang yin pas / bya byed sogs kyi dbang gis ming gzhi gang la 'phul yig gang 'jug mi 'jug dang / 'jug pa'i don dang khyad par rnams la mdzub khrid dang brgal lan sogs kyis nges shes drongs thag chod [153] dgos so //

§53. **bsTan dar pa**'i 'grel bar yang / ming rkyang rnams skabs 'di'i dper brjod du mi rung gsungs pa yang / ming la bya byed sogs kyi don du 'phul 'jug pas yig sdeb mi 'dra bar 'gyur ba'i tshul la nges shes rnal ma drongs pa gal che bar dgongs nas dmigs phug pa'i bshad pa mdzad pa yin pas de kho na dang por bslab dgos so //

§54. de ltar ming la 'phul 'jug tshul legs par shes pa na / byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel ma 'brel gang yin rung ming rkyang la yang sngon 'jug rnams bya byed kyi don sogs ston pa'i phyir ji ltar 'jug pa shes dgos pas na mdo tsam brjod de / de yang ming rkyang gi dngos po / yan lag / yul / yod / med / tshad ma / 'dra / rgyun sogs mtha' yas pa rnams la bya byed kyi dbang gis 'phul nam yang mi 'jug go // des na 'phul 'jug pa'i ming rkyang ni / sngags / stod / dor / thob sogs mang po yod pa rnams yin te / dper brjod na / bsngags bya / bsngags byed / bsngags zin / bsngags shig / bstod bya / bstod byed⁶⁵ / bstod do / bstod cig ces pa lta bu yig sdeb gtan nas mi 'gyur ba dang / dor bya / 'dor byed / dord zin / dord cig / thob bya / 'thob byed / thob zin / thob cig lta bu sdeb cung zad 'gyur ba lta bu yin no //

§55. der ma zad ming la 'phul yig ma zhugs kyang byed pa po gzhan dang 'brel ma 'brel gyi bya byed la sogs pa'i don ston pa'ang mang po yod de / dper brjod na / blang bya / len byed / blangs zin / longs shig / myang bya / myong byed / myangs zin / myongs shig ces pa lta bu yig sdeb gtan 'gyur dang / spyad bya / spyod byed / spyad zin / spyod cig / rbad bya / rbod byed / rbad zin / rbod cig lta bu cung zad 'gyur ba rnams yod do //

⁶⁵ Ego bstod byed: Text bstod byad.

§56. sngon ‘jug gi shin tu mo ma yig ni / byed pa po gzhan dang ‘brel ba’i dngos po bdag gzhan gnyis ka dang / byed pa dang bya ba’i las dang / dus gsum kar ‘jug pa tshig la zin pas / byed po gzhan ‘brel min pa’i bdag gzhan sogs la ‘jug pa don gyis thob pa yin pas / de thams cad [154] la mnyam pa ste khyad par med par ston pa’i phyir du ming gzhi la ‘jug par ‘gyur ro //

§57. dngos po bdag la ‘jug pa dper brjod na /

mkhas pa po /

mthol ba po /

zhes pa dang / dngos po gzhan la ‘jug pa /

mkhas bya’i gnas /

mthol bya’i tshig /

ces pa dang / byed pa la ‘jug pa /

mkhas par byed /

mkhas byed /

mkhas /

mthol bar byed /

mthol byed /

mthol /

zhes pa dang / bya ba’i yul lam las la ‘jug pa /

mkhas par bya /

mkhas bya /

mkhas /

mthol bar bya /

mthol bya /

mthol /

zhes pa dang / [155] byas zin ‘das pa la ‘jug pa /

mkhas par byas /

mkhas zin /

mkhas /

mthold par byas /
 mthold zin /
 mthold /

ces pa dang / dmigs kyis byed pa'am dus kyis dus da lta ba la 'jug pa /

mkhas kyin /
 mthol gyin /

zhes pa dang / dmigs kyis dus kyis dus ma 'ongs pa la 'jug pa /

mkhas par 'gyur /
 mthol bar 'gyur /

zhes pa lta bu'o //

§58. byed las su gtogs pa'i bskul tshig gi 'jug pa rtsa bar dngos su ma gsungs pa ni / bskul tshig la 'phul yig mi 'jug pas yin yang / dang po'i khrid rgyun las 'ongs pa 'grel bshad mkhan po snga ma rnams kyis gsal bar mdzad pa ste / dper brjod na /

snod khongs shig /
 chu khog cig /
 me tog thord cig /

ces pa lta bu yin la /

rten la mjold cig /
 tshad 'jold cig / [156]

lta bu ming 'jug pa'ang yod do // bskul tshig la cig zhig shig gang thob kyang khyad par med mod dpe khungs dag par / phye shig ces pa lta bu 'ga' re snang bas bskul ba gsal byed du zhig las shig sbyar ba nus pa che bar snang ngo //