

PENTTI AALTO
(HELSINKI)

CONDITIONALS IN BUDDHIST SANSKRIT

The conditional (Pāṇini 3,3,139-140, *Siddhāntakaumudī* 2796 ff.) is one of the most rarely occurring forms of the Sanskrit verb. Whitney states in his fundamental grammar (§ 941) that there is only one instance to be found in the *R̥gveda* (2,30,2), 15 in the *Brāhmaṇas*¹ in addition to the somewhat more than 50 in the *Śatapatha-Br.* (see Minard I § 122a, II § 788f.), one in *Manu* (7,20) and two in the *Śakuntalā*. Later scholars have, however, been able to identify further occurrences e. g. in the *Purāṇas* (e. g. *Bhāgavata* 10,47,21; 10,28,11; see Gonda p. 195), in the great epics *Mahābhārata* (e.g. 3,268,19; 5,48,55; 7,72,71; 8,68,5 (Keith) and 26 and 30,8,70,27; 12,167,34; 13,1,12; see Holtzmann, *Grammatisches aus Mbh.* §§ 941, 950) and *Rāmāyaṇa* (Böhtlingk ZDMG. 43, 1889, p. 58 quotes two cases, viz. 2,62,28 and 4,12,37, while Michelson JAOS. 25 p. 136 has found only one, viz. 6,128,67 which is expressly named in commentaries), in *Upaniṣads* (one in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, 13 in the *Chāndogya*; see Fürst p. 24 and Gonda p. 194) and also in the "classical" literature (e.g. one in the *Pañc.*, 2 in the *Daśakumāracarita* according to Gawronski, 3 in the *Kumārasaṃbhava*, 6,67-68; 7,20; 7,66, one in Bhavabhūti's *Mālatīmādhava* 9,5,1, in *Hammīramahākavya* 2,89; cf. further Renou § 340, Speijer p. 266, Barth III p. 361 ff.).

The conditional is to be met with in the Jaina literature too. Mironov, for example, quotes 4 occurrences in Amitagati's *Dharmaparīkṣā*, but the only case found by Schmidt and Hertel (ZDMG. 59,1905, p. 564) in the *Subhāṣitasamdoha* (v. 376) of the same author the conditional seems to have been improperly used: Renou classes it (§ 340 note) among "emplois remarquables".

Senart believed (p. 59 of his edition of the *Mahāvastu*) that the conditional was unknown in Buddhist Sanskrit. This view has been corrected by later scholars, and e.g. Mironov (JRAS. 1927, p. 277 ff.) was able to point out 18 occurrences in the *Vajracchedikā-Prajñāpāramitā* and one in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. In his *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar* (§ 31.38 ff.) Edgerton does not mention

¹ Later scholars quote e.g. *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā* 4,1,9; 1,8,1: 1,9,3=*Pañcav-Br.* 17,1,1, *Aitareya* 4,30,6; 6,33, *Gopatha* 2,6,13, *Kauṣītaki* 30,5; 36,7, *Taittirīya* 3,11,8,7, *Aitareya-Āraṇyaka* 2,4,3, *Vādhūlasūtra* 4,35 (Caland § 22), *Āpastambīya-Dharmas.* 1.10,29,9; see further e.g. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar for Students* § 218.

the instances indicated by Mironov but he quotes several cases in the *Mahāvastu* and the *Lalitavistara*, which, though somewhat irregular, are according to him to be regarded as conditionals. Gonda mentions further (p. 194) one case in the *Buddhacarita* (8,41) by Aśvaghōṣa, and Renou 2 in the *Divyāvadāna* (30,8).

In addition to those in the *Vajracchedikā* cited above further instances seem to be found in other Prajñāpāramitā works. Thus in the Central Asiatic fragments published by J. N. Reuter in Mannerheim's *Across Asia* three occurrences are met with:

(p. 9) *sacet, Subhūte, tathāgatasyārhatē samyaksaṃbuddhasya dharmacakraṃ bhāvo 'pyabhaviṣyat na tvabhāvo nedaṃ tathāgato 'rhan samyaksaṃ[buddho] dharmacakra[m] pravarttayiṣyat* (read *prā-?*).

(p. 10) *sacet, Subhūte, satvāni bhāvāny abhaviṣyat...na hi tāni satvānyanutpādaśeṣe nirvāṇadhātāvaparinirvāpayiṣyat.*

(p. 13) *sacet punar devaputrās tato nirvāṇād anyañ kaścīd dharmo viśiṣṭataro 'pyabhaviṣyat tam apyandharmaṃ svapnopamaṃ māyopamaṃ cāvadiṣyat.*

The two former cases come from fragments belonging to the *Śatasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā*, while the third has not been identified with certainty.

In the *Suvikrāntavikrāmi-Prajñāpāramitā* (Matsumoto p. 52 ff.) we find a couple of instances :

(p.13) *sacet nirveddhavyam abhaviṣyat, prajñapyeta : iyaṃ sā prajñā yā nirvi-dhyatīti.*

(p. 24) *sacet kaścīd dharmah syād : aham iti vā mameti vā aham asmīti vā, tena bhūtāḥ satvā abhaviṣyan.*

In classical Sanskrit the function of the conditional was more often performed by the optative, which is used in the same way in Buddhist Sanskrit too. These moods can also be used in connection with each other, as we can see in the above cases with an optative in the protasis and a conditional in the apodosis or vice versa². A similar construction is met with in the *Vajracchedikā* (9e and 25 below). As to the latter case Pargiter's Central Asiatic manuscript reads (according to Con e's critical apparatus) *parimocito bhaviṣyat* instead of *parimocitaḥ syāt* of the other codices. The sentence in question has been re-shaped by the Tibetan translators in a way that perhaps points to a conditional in their archetype too.

² Cf. the parallels Mahābhārata 12,15,30 *daṇḍaś cen na bhavel loke vinaśyeyur imāḥ prajāḥ, jale matsyān ivābhakṣyan durbalān balavattarāḥ* and Manusmṛti 7,20 *yadi na praṇayed rājā daṇḍaṃ daṇḍyeṣv atandritaḥ, sūle matsyān ivāpakṣyan durbalān balavattarāḥ.*

In the introduction to his translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (SBE XXI, p. xvi) Kern remarks that there is an obvious lexical affinity between Buddhist Sanskrit and the language of the *Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa*. Developing this observation further, Mironov presents the hypothesis that the relatively frequent use of the conditional might be regarded as a further, syntactical proof of a closer relationship between these two kinds of Sanskrit. The conditional has been preserved in Pāli too, while it seems to have totally disappeared in all the other Prakrits³. Mironov therefore suggests that "this trait of syntactic similarity, obviously not so easily borrowed as a lexical peculiarity (involving phonetic ones) may help us to determine the dialect which served as a base to Buddhist Sanskrit."

On the other hand, W. Schmid⁴ has suggested that in the Sanskrit future an innovation originating in the language of the Kṣatriya caste can be seen, and Renou (*Histoire* p. 58) points out that the usage of Sanskrit in certain Brāhmaṇas (e.g. the *Śatapatha-Br.*) reveals traits which are to be explained as reflecting the penetration of Kṣatriya elements into the authoritative circles of the Aryan society. Perhaps the development and spreading of the conditional also reflects the same social trend. Both Jainism and Buddhism can, at least to a certain extent, be considered Kṣatriya opposition to the predominant Brāhmaṇa caste.

Investigations carried out by Lüders and other scholars have revealed both in Buddhist Sanskrit and in Pāli important common features which are to be regarded as "Magadhisms". These have been interpreted through the a priori probable hypothesis that the oldest Buddhist texts were in Māgadhī and were later translated into Sanskrit and Pāli. Helmer Smith, one of the most eminent experts in Pāli, considered this language a kind of Old Śaurasenī. As to the conditional we have, however, no proofs of its usage in Māgadhī or Śaurasenī. On the other hand, the conditional seems to have belonged to a certain type of discussion between a teacher and a pupil. Some turns of phrase are obviously

³ In Prakrits numerous instances of the future with irregular endings occur (Pischel §520 ff.). Edgerton has found also in Buddhist Sanskrit futures with secondary or otherwise irregular endings (§31.30 ff.) and irregular conditionals (§31.39) as well as augmented futures with primary endings (§31.40). There are further similar futures and conditionals also in Pāli (Geiger §150 ff. and §157). Michelson (p. 135 f.) quotes from the *Rāmāyaṇa* several cases of substitution of secondary for primary endings in the future (as to the irregularities of the verb in the *Rāmāyaṇa* in general cf. Renou, *Histoire* p. 106). A detailed study of all such irregularities in the formation of the future would probably be useful for the elucidation of the history of the conditional.

⁴ *Studien zum baltischen und indogermanischen Verbum*, (Wiesbaden 1963), p. 38.

traditional, e.g. *Śatapatha-Br.* 11,5,3,13 *yad evam nāvaksyo mūrdhā te vyapatisyat*, *Gopatha-Br.* 1,3,14 *evam cen nāvaksyo mūrdhā te vyapatisyat*, *Chândogya-Up.* 1,11,7 *tām ced avidvān udgāsyāh, mūrdhā te vyapatisyat*⁵, further *Śatapatha-Br.* 10,6,1,4 *pādau te 'mlāsyatām yadi ha nāgamisyāh, Chândogya-Up.* 5,17,2 *pādau te vyamlāsyetām yan māṃ nāgamisyā iti*. In Buddhist texts also the conditional is most often met with in discussions between the Master and some of his pupils (cf. the instances above and below).

Since the grammatical structure of Tibetan differs in essence from that of Sanskrit, it might be of some interest to see how Sanskrit conditionals have been rendered in Tibetan translations of Buddhist texts. In the following I quote the instances occurring in the *Vajracchedikā*. The Sanskrit text is given according to the edition by Conze (Serie Orientale Roma XIII, Roma 1957), the Tibetan according to the edition by I.J. Schmidt (*Über das Mahājāna und Pradschnāpāramitā*, Mémoires de l'Acad. Imp. d. Sciences de St. Pétersbourg VI^e série, tome IV, St. Pthg. 1840).

The Tibetan translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* passage quoted by Mironov was kindly supplied by my friend Professor Nils Simonsson from the Central-Asiatic version acquired by the Hedin Expedition⁶.

Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā :

9e (Conze p. 35 and p. 72) *sacen māṃ, Bhagavann, evam bhaven : mayārhattvaṃ prāptam iti, na māṃ Tathāgato vyākariṣyad : araṇā-vihārināṃ agryaḥ Subhūtiḥ kulaputro na kvacid viharati, tenocyate 'raṇā-vihāryaraṇāhārīti*.

“If to me, O Lord, it would thus occur, ‘by me has Arhatship been attained’, the Tathagata would not have declared of me, ‘the foremost of those who dwell in Peace’, Subhuti, son of good family, dwells not anywhere, therefore is he called ‘a dweller in Peace, a dweller in Peace.’”

(Schmidt p. 143 f.) *bčom ldan 'das gal te 'di sñam du bdag gis dgra bčom pa ñid thob bo sñam du sems par gyur na, de bžin gšegs pas bdag la rigs kyi bu rab 'byor ni ñon moṅs pa med par gnas pa rnam kyi mčhog yin te, či la yañ mi gnas pas na ñon moṅs pa med par gnas pa žes luñ mi ston lags so*.

14e (Conze p. 41 and p. 77) *sacen me, Subhūte, tasmīn samaya ātma-saṃjñā-bhaviṣyad vyāpāda-saṃjñāpi me tasmīn sa-naye 'bhaviṣyat, sacet sattva-saṃjñā*

⁵ Cf. *Śatapatha* 14,6 9,28 *taṃ cen me na virakṣyasi, mūrdhā te vipatiṣyati*, 3,6,1,23 *sa yo ha tatrāśnīyād vā bhakṣayed vā, mūrdhā hāsyā vipated*.

⁶ See the detailed description of this manuscript by Simonsson in his *Indo-tibetische Studien*, (Uppsala 1957), p. 16 ff.

jīva-samjñā pudgala-samjñābhaviṣyad vyāpāda-samjñāpi me tasmin samaye 'bhaviṣyat.

“If, Subhuti, at that time I had had a perception of self, I would also have had a perception of ill-will at that time. If I had had a perception of a being, a perception of a soul, a perception of a person, then I would also have had a perception of ill-will at that time.”

(Schmidt p. 154) *rab 'byor gal te de'i che na la bdag tu 'du śes byuñ na, de'i che gnod sems kyi 'du śes kyañ byuñ la, sems čan du 'du śes pa dañ, srog tu 'du śes pa dañ, gañ zag tu 'du śes byuñ na, de'i che gnod sems kyi 'du śes kyañ 'byuñ ba'i phyir-ro.*

17b (Conze p. 47 and p. 82) *sacet punaḥ₂ Subhūte, kaścīd dharmas Tathāgate-nābhisambuddho 'bhaviṣyat, na māṃ Dīpaṅkaras Tathāgato vyākariṣyad: bhaviṣyasi tvaṃ māṇavānāgate 'dhvani Śākyamunir nāma Tathāgato 'rhan samyak-sambuddha iti.*

“If again, Subhuti, some dharma had been fully known by the Tathagata, not of me would the Tathagata Dipankara have predicted: ‘You, young Brahmin, will in a future period be a Tathagata, Arhat, Fully Enlightened’.”

(Schmidt p. 164) *rab 'byor gal te de bžin gśegs pas gañ mñon par rjogs par sañs rgyas pa'i čhos de 'ga' žig yod par gyur na, de bžin gśegs pa mar me mjad kyiś na la bram ze'i khye'u khyod ma 'oñs pa'i dus na, de bžin gśegs pa dgra bčom pa yañ dag par rjogs pa'i sañs rgyas śā kya thub pa žes bya bar 'gyur ro, žes luñ mi ston pa žig na.*

19 (Conze p. 52 and p. 86) *sacet, Subhūte, punyaskandho 'bhaviṣyan, na Tathāgato 'bhāṣiṣyat punyaskandhaḥ punyaskandha iti.*

“If there would be a heap of merit, the Tathagata would not have taught ‘heap of merit, heap of merit’.”

(Schmidt p. 170 f.) *yañ rab 'byor gal te bsod nams kyi phuñ po bsod nams kyi phuñ por gyur pa na, bsod nams kyi phuñ po bsod nams kyi phuñ po žes de bžin gśegs pa mi gsuñ ño.*

25 (Conze p. 55 and p. 88) *yadi punaḥ, Subhūte, kaścīd sattvo 'bhaviṣyat, yas Tathāgatena parimocitaḥ syāt, sa eva Tathāgatasyātmagrāho 'bhaviṣyat, sattvagrāho jīvagrāhaḥ pudgalagrāho 'bhaviṣyat.*

“Again, if there had been any being who had been set free by the Tathagata, then surely there would have been on the part of the Tathagata a

seizing of self, seizing of a being, seizing of a soul, seizing of a person.”

(Schmidt p. 175 f.) *rab 'byor gal te de bžin gšegs pas sems čan gañ la la žig dgrol bar gyur na, de ñid de bžin gšegs pa'i bdag tu 'jin 'gyur, sems čan du 'jin pa dañ, srog tu 'jin pa dañ, gañ zag tu 'jin par 'gyur ro.*

26a (Conze p. 56 and p. 88) *sacet punaḥ, Subhūte, lakṣaṇasampadā Tathāgato draṣṭavyo 'bhaviṣyad, rājāpi cakravartī Tathāgato 'bhaviṣyat.*

“If, Subhuti, the Tathagata were one who could be seen by his possession of marks, then also the universal monarch would be a Tathagata.”

(Schmidt p. 176 f.) *rab 'byor gal te mchan phun sum chogs pas de bžin gšegs par blta bar 'gyur na, 'khor los bsgyur ba'i rgyal po yañ de bžin gšegs par 'gyur te.*

30a (Conze p. 59 and p. 90) *saced, Bhagavan, bahuḥ paramāṇu-saṃcayo 'bhaviṣyat, na Bhagavān avakṣyat paramāṇu-saṃcaya iti.*

“If, O Lord, there would have been an enormous collection of atomic quantities, the Lord would not have called it an ‘enormous collection of atomic quantities’.”

(Schmidt p. 180) *bčom ldan 'das gal te rdul phra rab kyi chogs śig mčhis par gyur na, bčom ldan 'das kyi rdul phra rab kyi chogs žes bka' mi scol ba'i slad du'o.*

30b (Conze p. 60 and p. 91) *saced, Bhagavan, loka-dhātur abhaviṣyat, sa eva piṇḍagrāho 'bhaviṣyat.*

“If, O Lord, there would have been a world-system, that would have been (a case of) seizing on a material object”.

(Schmidt p. 181) *bčom ldan 'das gal te 'jig rten gyi khams śig mčhis par gyur na, de ñid ril por 'jin par 'gyur ba'i slad du'o.*

Saddharmapundarika chapter XIX (Kern-Nanjio p. 381,15-382,1, Kern p. 359, Mironov p. 279): *yadi mayā, Mahāsthāmaprāpta, pūrvam ayaṃ dharmaparyāyo nodgṛhīto 'bhaviṣyan na dhārito nāham evaṃ kṣīpram anuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim abhisambuddho 'bhaviṣyam.*

“Had I not formerly grasped and kept this *Dharmaparyāya*, *Mahāsthāmaprāpta*, I should not so soon have arrived at supreme, perfect enlightenment.”

(Tm B 27,3-4) *gal te mthu čhen po thob pa űas sion čhos gyi gžuñ 'di ma blañs ma bzuñ bar gyur na, űa myur du 'di ltar bla na myed pa yañ dag par rjogs*

pa'i byañ čhub du mñon bar sañs rgyas par myi 'gyur te.

The correspondences are thus as follows (protasis = A, apodosis=B) :

V 9e A *bhavet=sems par gyur na*
B *na vyākariṣyat = luñ mi ston lags so*

14e A *abhaviṣyat = byuñ na A*
B *abhaviṣyat = byuñ na A*
A *abhaviṣyat = byuñ la A*
B *abhaviṣyat = 'byuñ ba'i phyir ro B*

The Tibetan translators have thus combined the two sentences into one.
As to *byuñ la* cf. Bacot II p. 118 instance No. 49 : *gal te khyod kyi pags pa bśus te śog śog tu byas la...* 'si après avoir écorché ta peau et en avoir fait des feuilles de parchemin, fait...'

17b A *abhaviṣyat = (žig yod par) gyur na*
B *na vyākariṣyad (bhaviṣyasi) = ('gyur ro žes) luñ mi ston pa žig na*
19 A *abhaviṣyat = gyur pa na* (the meaning of *pa* here is not clear to me)
B *na...abhāṣiṣyat = mi gsuñ ño*

25 A *abhaviṣyat yah syāt = gyur na*
B *abhaviṣyat = 'gyur...'gyur*
B *abhaviṣyat = 'gyur ro*

26a A *abhaviṣyat = 'gyur na*
B *abhaviṣyat = 'gyur te*

In all other cases Tibetan shows the perfect stem of the verb in protasis; it is only here that the future stem occurs. The condition has obviously been understood as valable also in present and future.

30a A *abhaviṣyat = gyur na*
B *na avakṣyat = bka' mi scol ba'i slad du'o*

30b A *abhaviṣyat = gyur na*
B *abhaviṣyat = 'gyur ba'i slad du'o*

SP A *na...abhaviṣyat = ma...gyur na*
B *na abhaviṣyam = myi...'gyur te*

Thus in apodosis Tibetan always shows a present-future, either simple or formed with an auxiliary without any further modal indicator, or an infinitive with a postposition, depending on the idiomatic construction of the Tibetan sentence in question. In V 9e the speaker is Subhuti, in 17b Buddha; this difference

is obviously reflected in the differing translations of *vyākariṣyat*. In the latter case *ston pa žig na* perhaps also reflects the very remote past when this *vyākaraṇa* was pronounced. Bell's⁷ rule that the second clause takes the perfect indicative when joined to a past conditional clause does not seem to have been clearly followed in our instances. In Sanskrit the tense of a conditional clause must often be concluded from its contents, as shown by the sentences quoted by commentators to elucidate Pāṇini's rules regarding the use of the conditional as a future tense (*liṅ nimitte lṛṅ kriyātipattau*): *yadi varṣasahasram ajīviṣyam tadā putraśatam ajanayiṣyam*, and as a past tense (*bhūte ca*): *yadi śilāḥ komalā abhaviṣyam, tadā kroṣṭubhir evābhakṣayiṣyanta*.

The local particle *na* added to the perfect stem is thus the normal Tibetan method of translating the Sanskrit conditional. The most common conditional in Sanskrit is, as is shown by the above instances, the stereotyped *abhaviṣyat*, and Sarat Chandra Das registers its normal Tibetan equivalent *gyur na=syāt, abhaviṣyat* 'if it so happened, if it became so' as a special item (p. 236a).

In other languages also a local case of a verbal noun can in an appropriate context express conditionality, e.g. a Sanskrit locativus absolutus: *Bṛhadāranyaka-Up. 1,4,10 ekasminneva paśāvādīyamāne 'priyaṃ bhavati* 'even if only one animal is ~ would be taken away, it is unpleasant'. In Tamil *āy-in*, Telugu *ē-ni* 'in being' > 'in the event of being' > 'if is ~ should be' etc. is used. In Tamil a noun *kāl* 'place' can be appended to the past relative participle, e.g. *śeyda-(k)kal* 'if I do ~ did' (Caldwell p. 526 ff.). Finnish constructions with an infinitive in a local case can—depending on the context—assume a conditional meaning, e.g. *haluttaessa työt noudetaan tilaajan kotoa* 'if it is desired, the work will be collected at the customer's house' (Hakulinen p. 365). An unreal conditional, however, cannot be expressed in Finnish by such a construction.

LITERATURE CITED

- Jacques Bacot, *Grammaire du tibétain littéraire I-II*. (Paris 1946-48).
 Auguste Barth, *Oeuvres I-V*. (Paris 1914-18).
 C.A. Bell, *Grammar of Colloquial Tibetan*, (Alipore 1939).
 Robert Caldwell, *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages*. 3rd ed., (Madras 1961).

⁷ Bell p. 49, cf. further Jäschke p. 57 and p. 157, as well as the sentences 8, 11, 19, 21, 28 on Bacot's pp. 64-65 (there is no example of an unreal past conditional among them), and Lalou §§ 17,2d; 21,2; 26,8; 27,6e; 34,2b.

- S. C. Das, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms*. Repr. (Alipore 1960).
- B. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, (Halle 1888).
- A. Fürst, *Der Sprachgebrauch der älteren Upaniṣads verglichen mit dem der früheren vedischen Perioden und des klassischen Sanskrit*. (Diss. Tübingen), (Göttingen 1915).
- W. Geiger, *Pāli, Literatur und Sprache*, (Strassburg 1916).
- Lauri Hakulinen, *Structure and Development of the Finnish Language*, Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series Vol. 3., (Bloomington, Ind. 1961).
- H. A. Jäschke, *Tibetan Grammar*. Addenda by A. H. Francke assisted by W. Simon (Berlin 1929).
- Marcelle Lalou, *Manuel élémentaire du tibétain classique*, (Paris 1950).
- Armand Minard, *Trois énigmes sur les Cent Chemins*, (Paris 1949).
- R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, (Strassburg 1900).
- Louis Renou, *Grammaire sanskrit*. 2nd ed., (Paris 1961).
- J. S. Speijer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, (Leyden 1886).
- W.D. Whitney, *A Sanskrit Grammar*. 8th ed., (1955).