

國立中央研究院歷史語言研究所敬贈

林藜光先生

中華民國二十年三月

Published at the BENGAL SECRETARIAT BOOK DEPÔT,
Writers' Buildings, Calcutta.

OFFICIAL AGENTS.

In India—

MESSRS. THACKER, SPINK & Co., Calcutta and Simla.
MESSRS. NEWMAN & Co., Calcutta.
MESSRS. HIGGINBOTHAM & Co., Madras.
MESSRS. THACKER & Co., LD., Bombay.
MESSRS. A. J. COMBRIDGE & Co., Bombay.
THE SUPERINTENDENT, AMERICAN BAPTIST MISSION PRESS, Rangoon.
MRS. RADHABAI ATMARAM SAGOON, Bombay.
MESSRS. S. K. LAHIRI & Co., Printers and Book-sellers, College Street,
Calcutta.
RAI SAHIB M. GULAB SINGH & SONS, Proprietors of the Mufid-i-am Press,
Lahore, Punjab.
MESSRS. V. KALYANARAMA IYER & Co., Book-sellers, &c., Madras.
MESSRS. D. B. TARAPOREVALA, SONS & Co., Book-sellers, Bombay.
MESSRS. G. A. NATESON & Co., Madras.

In England—

MR. E. A. ARNOLD, 37 Bedford Street, Strand, London.
MESSRS. CONSTABLE & Co., 2 Whitehall Gardens, London.
MESSRS. SAMPSON LOW, MARSTON & Co., St. Dunstan's House, Fetter Lane,
London.
MESSRS. LUZAC & Co., 46 Great Russell Street, London.
MESSRS. KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co., Charing Cross Road,
London.
MR. B. ALFRED QUARITCH, 15 Piccadilly, London.
MESSRS. P. S. KING & SON, 2 & 4 Great Smith Street, Westminster, London.
MESSRS. H. S. KING & Co., 65 Cornhill, London.
MESSRS. WILLIAMS & NORGATE, Oxford.
MESSRS. DEIGHTON BELL & Co., Cambridge.

On the Continent—

MESSRS. R. FRIEDLÄNDER & SOHN, Berlin, N. W. Carlstrasse, 11.
MR. OTTO HARRASSOWITZ, Leipzig.
MR. KARL HIERSEMANN, Leipzig.
MR. ERNEST LEROUX, 28 Rue Bonaparte, Paris.
MR. MARTINUS NIJHOFF, The Hague.

[illegible]

A
TIBETAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY

WITH SANSKRIT SYNONYMS

BY

SARAT CHANDRA DAS, RAJ BAHADUR, C.I.E.,

AUTHOR OF "A JOURNEY TO LHASA AND
CENTRAL TIBET."

Revised and Edited under the orders of the Government of Bengal

BY

GRAHAM SANDBERG, B.A.,

CHAPLAIN, H. M. INDIAN SERVICE; AUTHOR OF "A HAND-BOOK OF COLLOQUIAL
TIBETAN," "MANUAL OF THE SIKKIM-BHUTIA LANGUAGE," "MILARASPA,
TIBETAN POET AND MYSTIC," ETC., ETC., ETC.,

AND

A. ~~WILLIAM~~ ~~HEYDE~~,
~~RAJ BAHADUR~~

ONE OF THE REVISORS OF THE ~~TIBETAN~~ ~~NEW~~ TESTAMENT, MORAVIAN MISSIONARY ON THE
~~TIBETAN FRONTIER~~

CALCUTTA:

PUBLISHED BY THE BENGAL SECRETARIAT BOOK DEPÔT.

1902.

[Price—Indian, Rs. 32; English, £2. ~~10s.~~]

CALCUTTA :

PRINTED AT THE BENGAL SECRETARIAT PRESS.

PREFACE.

I.

ALEX. CSOMA DE KÖRÖS, the pioneer student of Tibetan, in the preface of his Tibetan-English-Dictionary, published in 1834, wrote as follows:—

“When there shall be more interest taken for Buddhism (which has much in common with the spirit of true Christianity) and for diffusing Christian and European knowledge throughout the most eastern parts of Asia, the Tibetan Dictionary may be much improved, enlarged, and illustrated by the addition of Sanskrit terms.”

The result of his investigations, to speak in Csoma's own words, was that the literature of Tibet is entirely of Indian origin. The immense volumes on different branches of science, etc., being exact or faithful translations from Sanskrit works, taken from Bengal, Magadha, Gangetic or Central India, Kashmir, and Nepal, commencing from the seventh century after Christ. And that many of these works have been translated (mostly from Tibetan) into the Mongol, Manchu, and the Chinese languages; so that by this means the Tibetan language became in Chinese Tartary the language of the learned as the Latin in Europe. In the year 1889 I brought these opinions of that original investigator to the notice of Sir Alfred Croft, K.C.I.E., the then Director of Public Instruction in Bengal, and explained to him the necessity of compiling a Tibetan-English Dictionary on the lines indicated by Csoma de Körös for the use of Tibetan students and particularly to assist European scholars in the thorough exploration of the vast literature of Tibet, which, besides indigenous works, comprises almost all the Buddhist religious works of India, including the great collections of the *Kahgyur* and the *Tanqyur*. Shortly before this Sir Alfred Croft had received a communication from the late Right Hon'ble Professor F. Max Müller on the desirability of translating into English a Sanskrit-Tibetan work on Buddhist terminology, which was looked for with interest, because it was expected to throw light on many obscure points of Buddhist-Sanskrit literature. The philosophical terms of that literature, many

of which were of extremely doubtful meaning, had been translated with literal accuracy into Tibetan in early times, and it was anticipated that an analysis of the meaning of these terms would elucidate that of the original Sanskrit words, of which they were the equivalent renderings. Being impressed with the importance of the proposed work, Sir Alfred Croft, in a memorandum addressed to Government, wrote as follows:—

“Babu Sarat Chandra Das has brought with him four dictionaries of the classical Tibetan; one of these being a well-known Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary, compiled from a large number of named Tibetan as well as standard Sanskrit works, and dating from the 13th century A.D., and another being a Sanskrit-Tibetan Dictionary, which explains the Tantrik portion of the Buddhist Scriptures. The external arrangement of the dictionary will be as follows:—The Tibetan words will be placed first in alphabetical order; next their accepted Sanskrit equivalents; next the English rendering of the Tibetan terms; then will follow what is to be a special and valuable feature of the new dictionary. The meaning of each technical term is to be illustrated by extracts, with exact references from Sanskrit-Buddhist and Tibetan works. Further, it is proposed that Babu Sarat Chandra Das should include in the dictionary words of modern Tibetan which were not known to Csoma or Jäschke. The materials which he has amassed during his two journeys to and residence in Tibet give him exceptional facilities for making the work complete.”

These recommendations having received the sanction of Government in June 1889, I was placed on special duty in connection with the compilation of the proposed dictionary. In 1899, when the work of compilation was brought to a close, the Hon'ble Mr. C. W. Bolton, C.S.I., then Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal, entrusted the revision of the work to the Revd. Graham Sandberg and Revd. William Heyde, and deputed Professor Satis Chandra Acharya, M.A., who had made Buddhist Sanskrit and Pali works his special study, to co-operate with me. My respectful thanks are, therefore, due to Sir Alfred Croft for the keen interest he took in my Tibetan studies and for his kind help at the inception of the work, and to Mr. Bolton for securing the services of the two Tibetan scholars—the Revd. Graham Sandberg and Revd. William Heyde—for its successful completion. I also record my obligations to Sir John

Edgar, K.C.I.E., formerly Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal; to Dr. Emil Schlagintweit of Bavaria, and to the Hon'ble W. W. Rockhill, Author of *The Land of Lamas* for encouragement, assistance, and advice during the prosecution of my researches. Great is the debt of gratitude which I owe to the Revd. G. Sandberg for various acts of kindness. Without his scholarly and efficient aid this work would hardly have assumed its present shape, as he has given a scientific finish to the work which it was not in my power to do.

II.

In studying the origin and growth of Tibetan literature and the landmarks in the history of that language, Jäschke, the compiler of the second Tibetan-English Dictionary (published in 1882), noticed only two periods of literary activity. Had that critical student of Tibetan been in possession of works of modern literature, which dates from the establishment of the Dalai Lama's sovereignty over whole Tibet in the beginning of the 18th century A.D., he would certainly have modified his remarks on the subject. Neither he nor Csoma de Kőrös had any means or opportunities of studying either the current literature of everyday business or the refined, idiomatic literature of Tibet itself, which is quite distinct from the Indian literature that was translated or imported into the language. They do not seem to have ever during the course of their study of Tibetan come across works on drama, fiction, correspondence, etc. It is, therefore, no wonder that the compiler of the later dictionary should assign only two periods to the history of the literature of Tibet, entirely ignoring the third, which is indeed not the least important of the three.

The first period, to describe it in the language of Jäschke, is the Period of Translations, which, however, might also be entitled the Classical Period, for the sanctity of the religious message conferred a corresponding reputation and tradition of excellence upon the form in which it was conveyed. This period begins in the second half of the seventh century A.D., when Thon-mi Sambhoṭa (the good Bhoṭa or Tibetan), the minister of King Srongtsan Gampo, returned to Tibet after studying the Sanskrit language under an eminent Brahman teacher of Magadha. "His invention of the Tibetan alphabet gave two-fold impulse: for several centuries the wisdom of

India and the ingenuity of Tibet laboured in unison and with the greatest industry and enthusiasm at the work of translation. The tribute due to real genius must be accorded to these early pioneers of Tibetan grammar. They had to grapple with infinite wealth and refinement of Sanskrit; they had to save the independence of their own tongue, while they strove to subject it to the rule of scientific principles, and it is most remarkable how they managed to produce translations at once literal and faithful to the spirit of the original."

The Classical Period may be divided into three stages. The first or the earliest stage terminated with the downfall of the first historical monarchy, when King Langdarma fell by the hand of an assassin. The second stage commenced with the introduction of the system of chronology, called the Vrihaspati cycle of 60 years, in Tibet by an Indian Buddhist called Chandra Nath and Chilu Pandit of Tibet in 1025 A.D. This was the age of Milaraspa and Atisa, whose illustrious disciple, Brom-ton Gyalwai Jungné, laid the foundation of the first Buddhist Hierarchy in Tibet and established the great monastery of Rwaḍeng, with a library of Sanskrit works. Jäschke's second period evidently corresponds with this stage, when "Tibetan authors began to indulge in composition of their own" and wrote on historical and legendary subjects. The third stage began with the conquest of Tibet by the Tartar Conqueror, Chingis Khan, in 1205 A.D., when Pandit S'ākya S'ri of Kashmir had returned to Tibet after witnessing the plunder and destruction of the great Buddhist monasteries of Odantapuri and Vikrama S'īla in Magadha, and the conquest of Bengal and Behar by the Mahomedans under Baktyar Ghilji in 1203 A.D. In this last stage flourished the grand hierarchy of Sakya, which obtained supreme influence over Tibet and the country, which was then divided into 13 provinces, called Thikor Chusum, as a gift from the immediate successors of Chingis Khan. Among the most noted writers of the time were Sakya Pandit Kungah Gyal-tshan, Dogon Phag-pa, the spiritual tutor of Emperor Khubli Khan, and Shongton Lotsawa, who translated the *Kāvyaḍarśa* of Dandi and Kshemendra's *Avadāna Kalpalatā* in metrical Tibetan. With the opening of the 15th century Buten Rinchen Düb introduced a new era in the literature of Tibet, and Buddhism received fresh impulse under the rule of the Phagmodu chiefs, when Tibetan scholars took largely to the study of

SARAT CHANDRA DAS.

LEHSA VILLA, DARJEELING,
July 1902.

Chinese literature under the auspices of the Ming Emperors of China. During this period, called the age of Da-nying (old orthography), the great indigenous literature of Tibet arose. A host of learned Lotsāwas and scholars like Tsongkhapa, Buton, Gyalwa Ngapa, Lama Taranātha, Desri Sangye Gyatsho, Sumpa Khampo, and others flourished. This was the age of the Gelug-pa, or the Yellow Cap School of Buddhism, founded by Tsongkhapa with Galdan as its head-quarters. The third period begins with the first quarter of the 18th century, when Chinese suzerainty over Tibet was fully established and the last of the Tartar kings of the dynasty of Gushi Khan was killed by a General of the Jungar Tartars—an incident which transferred the sovereignty of Tibet to the Dalai Lama, who was till then a mere hierarch of the Gelug-pa Church. It is within this period that Tibet has enjoyed unprecedented peace under the benign sway of the holy Bodhisattvas, and its language has become the *lingua franca* of Higher Asia.

REVISORS' PREFACE.

WHEN in December 1899 the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal handed over to us for revision the Tibetan Dictionary upon which Sarat Chandra Das had laboured for some dozen years, we found at our disposal a work embracing a mass of new and important collections on the language, the value of which was marred by two prominent characteristics—*first*, the material had been put together in somewhat heterogeneous fashion, hardly systematic enough for a dictionary; *secondly*, the vast amount of original matter had been throughout greatly interlarded with lengthy excerpts from Jäschke's Dictionary, not always separable from the new information, and this imparted a second-hand appearance to large portions of the work, which was, in reality, by no means deserved. Moreover, in this way, no attempt had been made to improve upon Jäschke's definitions of many of the commoner Buddhist philosophical terms or to incorporate the later results of European scholarship in these instances. On the other hand, one was very often gratified to find, in the case of the more difficult philosophical terminology, that the learned Bengali had gone to original and little-explored sources of native information, such as Tsongkhapa's *Lam-rim Chhenmo*, and, by extracts from the same, furnished valuable and novel particulars under those heads.

Accordingly, the task which the Revisors set themselves was directed mainly to counteracting the errors of judgment above indicated. Such a task proved one of a more laborious character than might be at first imagined; and the fact that the work of amendment and addition has taken them upwards of two years of incessant toil sufficiently evidences its difficulty.

First, has come the business of selection and excision. The religion and philosophy of Tibetan books are properly confined to the Bon cult and to Buddhism. There had been, however, a tendency here to draw in all manner of Hindu thought and mythology, because one or two works translated into Tibetan from the Sanskrit dealt with these matters. This tendency it seemed right to curb except in those instances, not at all infrequent, where the Vedic and Puranic Hinduism, in some measure, was bound up with, or bore upon, or explained, Buddhist belief or popular practice.

Excision has had to be meted out, further, in the case of unnecessary repetition of otherwise properly-introduced information. *Secondly*, our task has been one of substitution. Many articles have had to be freshly written, or at least re-compiled. In place of the innumerable excerpts from Jäschke, already referred to, we have had to examine and to treat *de novo* the grammar and general usage of a large number of the commoner nouns, adjectives, and verbs, notably the verbs. To illustrate these new articles, we have had to substitute for Jäschke's examples a large number of original quotations from Tibetan authors as well as a certain number of made-up sentences put together to exhibit various phrases of ordinary employment. In other articles, also, where Sarat Chandra Das had not thought it necessary to do more than repeat Csoma's or Jäschke's illustrative sentences, we have looked out fresh examples to replace them. Of still greater importance was it in the case of certain doctrinal terms and phrases of Buddhism to undertake re-definition and to connote and assimilate modern discussion and research on the subject. Among those terms may be noted such as རྟེན, *rkjen*; རྟེན་འབྲེལ, *rten-hbrel*; ལྟ་བུ, *lta-wa*; རྩལ, *rdul*; བླ་མ, *bla-ma*; གཡུང་རྩུང, *gyuñ-druñ*; དེ་བཞིན་གཤམ་པ, *de-bshin-gcegs-pa*. But while referring to these substitutions and others of a like nature, we do not wish to assume too much. We would rather repeat that, in the matter of philosophical definitions also, we have been frequently surprised and instructed by the descriptions and explanations of recondite ideas and terms which Sarat Chandra Das has himself succeeded in collecting from various native authorities. Such information would have sufficed if he had not sometimes confused it by the sudden and inconsequent linking on of Jäschke's remarks without curtailment and without any connotation of them to that which he had himself just set out. *Thirdly*, in the way of direct addition to the original work, there have been certain moderate supplementary contributions. Jäschke had dealt very fully with the Western colloquial, and we have sought to introduce a number of the colloquial words and phrases belonging to the Central and Eastern speech. Other additions have been short paragraphs on the mythological pantheon of Tibet and Mongolia, together with an attempt to give exact information on zoological and geographical points.

It may be considered by some that there is a certain lack of reference to known authorities in support of many of the statements set forth in this work. However, it should be remembered that in dealing with a

language so little explored as the Tibetan (or which, indeed, in one narrow groove—that of the *Kahgyur* translations from Sanskrit—has, in some sense, been over-explored), the difficulty is to find adequate authorities for the real and more current uses of words and phrases. The stilted verbiage of the *Kahgyur* is often mere Sanskrit idiom literally rendered into Tibetan, but it gives no idea of the elastic style to be found in the innumerable indigenous productions of native Tibetan writers. Sarat Chandra Das has held familiar intercourse with modern men of learning in Tibet itself—the professors at Tashi-lhunpo, Daipung, Samye, Mindolling, and other important monastic institutions. Much, therefore, has been gleaned by him which, though absolutely reliable, cannot be given on any stated authority, but must be accepted as information obtained at first hand and now presented for the first time. This frank acceptance should also be extended to much with which the Revisors have been able to supplement the Author's original work. Both of them have been located for lengthy periods where Tibetan is the language of the people of the place, and have been in constant communication with men from Lhasa and all parts of Tibet. Under such circumstances, "authorities" cannot of course be quoted.

In dealing with philosophical terms, and in general with the forms to be met with both in the old classical works and in modern treatises, it will certainly be found, however, that our examples are constantly supported by exact references. These have been taken from writings of all kinds. Hitherto European scholars seem to have thought of the literature of Tibet as one consisting wholly of Sanskritic translation and as limited to the contents of the *Kahgyur* and *Tangyur*. The Author and the Revisors have endeavoured, by widening the sources of their quotations, to show how extensive a field is covered by mediæval and modern Tibetan writers. Geography, history, biography, political government, accounts, astrology, are all represented. It may be remarked, for example, that the official biographies of the successive Dalai Lamas alone fill some 32 volumes. Nevertheless, although these scarce memoirs are included in Sarat Chandra Das's library, we are sorry to point out that none of his examples appear to have been taken therefrom.

Knowing, however, how scanty is the range of Tibetan works available to the majority of students, we have not failed to quote largely in our examples from the *Kahgyur* and *Tangyur* collections. We may

note on this point that a suggestion has been forwarded to us that, in quoting from the former, special references should be given to Mons. Feer's *Textes tirés du Kandjour*. But we are afraid that the scope for quotation would be narrowed if our references to the *Kahgyur* were confined to Mons. Feer's very limited extracts published in lithograph form over 30 years ago. As to the *Index du Kandjour*, which was issued in the publications of the Musée Guimet 20 years back, it is evident to every Tibetan student that this *Index* was only a *réchauffé* of Csoma Korösi's much clearer and fuller analysis of the *Kahgyur* printed 68 years ago in the pages of the *Asiatic Researches*. We fear, indeed, that reliance on such works as these would rather expose us to charges of non-acquaintance with more recent results of European investigation in the present field. Although working in India, we may observe, however, that we have done our best to keep pace with what European Orientalists have written on our subject; but assistance has been mainly derived from the many memoirs compiled by Russian and German scholars, and we would specially recommend to notice the collections in this field made by Prince Ukhtomski and the very recent publications of Dr. Albert Grünwedel, Dr. A. Conrady, and Professor Huth. The analyses of the *Tangyur*, issued by Professor Huth during the last three or four years, are particularly noteworthy. To return, however, to the above-mentioned suggestion, we may say that not only would the scope be too restricted, but also there is no necessity, under present conditions, to refer to any mere collection of extracts. Nearly every capital city in Europe now has obtained possession of complete copies of the *Kahgyur* volumes, and in two or three libraries the 220 volumes of the *Tangyur* may be also consulted. In St. Petersburg are three full sets of the *Kahgyur* and two sets of the *Tangyur*; in Paris is a set of the *Kahgyur*; in one or other of the great German libraries both the Tibetan encyclopædia may be seen; in England, while curiously enough the British Museum Library owns only a small drawer-ful of loose Tibetan book-leaves, the India Office Library can boast a perfect series of both *Kahgyur* and *Tangyur*; and, lastly, in the Vatican Propaganda Library is preserved Oratio della Penna's incomplete collection of *Kahgyur* volumes.

A word as to the Sanskrit equivalents following each Tibetan term. Sanskrit scholars will perhaps consider these equivalents rather

unsystematically enumerated. They have, nevertheless, with regard to the majority of them, this particular value:—they were selected by native Indian scholars of mediæval and later days in collaboration with Tibetan *lotsawas* or translators, as the appropriate Sanskrit synonyms of the respective Tibetan words. They have been taken chiefly from one celebrated Sanskrit-Tibetan Dictionary, and supplemented by a well-known Calcutta pandit and professor, Satis Chandra Acharya *Vidyabhusan*, who has also considerable acquaintance with literary Tibetan. The same learned professor has also, in numerous instances, appended a literal English rendering of the Sanskrit terms. These renderings have been placed within square brackets with the initial *S* outside the brackets, and he alone is responsible for such translations.

The system of transliteration followed is that adopted finally at the Vienna Congress of Orientalists; and this system is observed in the case of all Tibetan and Sanskrit words intended to be literally transliterated and printed in *italics*. However, when a Tibetan or Sanskrit proper name occurs in Roman characters, not as a transliteration, but in the English explanation of a word, or in any English sentence as an integral part of such explanation or sentence, the name is spelled according to the conventional English fashion and, in the case of Sanskrit terms or names, as in Sir Monier Williams's Dictionary.

A considerable number of Tibetan words at the head of paragraphs will be found in larger type. This indicates either that the word is the root of all related terms, or that it is the most common word of the series and thus ostensibly that from which the others have been derived. Two different arbitrary signs will be found prefixed to many words. The Author, it seems, has marked such words as he considers archaic or gone out of present use with a *swastika* (✠), and those words deemed by him to have been imported into Tibetan from the Sanskrit, whether directly or by derivation, he has distinguished by a double-headed dagger (‡).

In conclusion, the Revisors would point out that although they have been given, and have generally taken, the greatest freedom in correcting or rejecting the matter set forth in this work, and for that reason cannot justly shift responsibility for the accuracy or non-accuracy of that which is herein written, nevertheless they have generally not reversed

the views and statements of the Author wherever these have seemed to them reasonable or fairly tenable, and to be the result of deliberately-formed opinion. They have felt, even when differing personally from the Author, that this Dictionary was Sarat Chandra Das's—not their own.

We must not omit to mention that, by the agency of the Chief Secretary to Government, certain brief comments on various portions of the Dictionary were received from Professor Bendall, and we have to thank him for his kind suggestions.

GRAHAM SANDBERG.

A. WILLIAM HEYDE.

DARJEELING, INDIA ;
The 1st March 1902. }