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IN a recent article on 'Words for "printing block" and the origin of printing',\(^1\) Mr. R. Shafer rejected B. Laufer’s derivation of Tibetan \textit{par} from Chinese \textit{baan} "printing block", which the latter had proposed in his article 'Loan-words in Tibetan',\(^2\) though, in fairness to Laufer, it must be added that he qualified his etymology by the adverb 'presumably'. While I fully agree with Mr. Shafer’s rejection of Laufer’s suggestion, I feel bound to say that he reached his conclusion from premises which are open to serious objections and indeed lend little support to the hypothesis on the origin of printing which he advances as a corollary.

The principal error is Mr. Shafer’s assumption that ‘Tibetan \textit{par} is a modern form’. Contrasting this allegedly ‘modern form’ with \textit{dpar} (stated by Laufer as occurring in the legend over the entrance to the Library of the Kumbum Monastery) and \textit{spar} (which is included in I. J. Schmidt’s Tibetan dictionary\(^3\)), Mr. Shafer recalls ‘the development of classical Tibetan \textit{dp-} to \textit{sp-} in the Burig (Purik) and Ladwags dialects and to simple \textit{p-} in the dialect of Lahul’ (for which he gives two examples) and concludes as follows:

‘So Laufer found the old classical Tibetan form \textit{dpar} in the inscription, Schmidt the western dialect form \textit{spar}, but Jäschke only \textit{par}, as he wrote many words in the pronunciation of Lahul when he could not find them in the literary works available to him. And one can be certain that Jäschke did not find the form \textit{par} in the literature, because he cited no references for his numerous examples of this word.’

It might be sufficient to refer Mr. Shafer to F. W. Thomas, \textit{Ancient folk-literature from north-eastern Tibet},\(^4\) in which an example of \textit{svh-par} occurs in a Tun-huang MS of the Stein Collection\(^5\) and references to \textit{dpar}\(^6\) and \textit{spar}\(^7\) can also be found. But in the interest of Tibetan lexicography generally and a better appreciation of Jäschke’s work in particular, I wish to make a few further points.

Mr. Shafer limited himself apparently to Jäschke’s dictionary and consulted neither Schmidt’s nor Csoma’s\(^8\) dictionaries. Otherwise he would have seen that Schmidt has merely a cross reference (with two examples) from

---

\(^1\) \textit{JAOS}, LXXX, 4, 1960, 328-9.
\(^2\) \textit{TP}, XVII, 1916, 512.
\(^3\) \textit{Tibetisch-deutsches Wörterbuch}, St. Petersburg, 1841.
\(^5\) Thomas, op. cit., VI, 11 (p. 120); cf. p. 130, n. 2.
\(^6\) ibid., VI, 63 (not 6, as given in the Tibetan vocabulary, p. 174), (p. 123); cf. p. 133, n. 7. and see also here below, p. 79.
\(^7\) ibid., p. 143, 1 a 3.
\(^8\) \textit{Essay towards a dictionary, Tibetan and English}, Calcutta, 1834.
spar to par, which is his main entry, and that Csoma’s dictionary not only contains practically all the examples given by Jäschke (including the important compound par-śīṅ, which Jäschke omitted 1), but even has a Tibetan title-page, in whose imprint the very word par occurs twice,² to say nothing of the occurrence of par in colophons (some of which are now easily accessible in Professor J. Bacot’s selection ³), or for that matter in the indexes (dkar-c’ags) to the various editions of the Kanjur and Tanjur. But the latter kind of texts, to which chapter headings like that of the last chapter ⁴ of the ‘Blue annals’ (Deb-t'er sñon-po) of 1481 may be added, do not lend themselves easily to inclusion as ‘sources’ in dictionary entries, and it was avowedly the absence of references in Jäschke’s dictionary that led Mr. Shafer to believe that ‘the pronunciation of Lahul’ could in any way be relevant for the relation between par, dpar, and spar. Nor did it occur to him, as it appears, that a lexicographer of the calibre and conscientiousness of Jäschke might have said in so many words if he had no written sources at his disposal.⁵ Except for pointing out in conclusion that words like baan 板, well attested in Chinese literature since the earliest times, ought to be free from the suspicion of being loan-words from Tibetan, I shall now attempt to establish the etymology of par (and its two derivatives) without any further reference to Mr. Shafer’s article.

I. par ‘mould’

It is interesting to note that Jäschke, who in the first version ⁶ of his dictionary simply listed ‘printing block’ and ‘mould’ as two separate meanings, combined them five years later under the general heading of ‘mould’ in his lithographed Tibetan and German dictionary,⁷ starting the entry par as follows:

‘I. Form. blugs—Gussf(orm): meistens jedoch ⁸ Druckform, aus Holz geschnittene Stereotypplatte. śīṅ-par dass(elbe). rko-ba sie schneiden, par-du ’debs-pa’ drucken, prägen.’

The English edition of 1881 adds rdeu-par ‘bullet-mould’ to the example blugs-par ‘casting mould’, which, being obviously modern, is in fact noted as C(entral Tibetan) s.v. rdeu (p. 286), and there given the additional meaning of ‘bullet-founder’. Jäschke then repeats his statement on blugs-par, leaving out, however, the qualification ‘meistens jedoch’: ‘blugs-par, as well as

---

¹ See below under I.
⁵ See his remark s.v. bdag-rkyen (p. 269) ‘as yet not found in books’.
⁶ The lithographed Romanized Tibetan and English dictionary, Kyelang in British Lahoul, 1866.
⁷ Handwörterbuch der Tibetischen Sprache, Gnadau, 1871.
⁸ The italics are mine.
śīn-par, printing form, a stereotype plate cut in wood. Indeed so great apparently was Jäschke's preoccupation with 'mould' being the primary meaning of par in the compound śīn-par that he omitted altogether the compound par-śīn 'printing block', which was already included in Csoma's dictionary, occurs many times, e.g., in the indexes to the various Kanjur and Tanjur editions, and is still at present the common word for 'printing block'. It was probably under Tibetan influence that Mongolian keb 'form, model', but also 'custom', acquired the meaning of 'printing block or type', side by side with modun keb, for which already Kowalewski noted śīn-par as Tibetan equivalent. Apart from what may be a 'loan translation', Tibetan par left a further mark in the Mongolian vocabulary. It has been incorporated as a loan-word in the spelling bar, for which Kowalewski gives par and spar as Tibetan equivalents. With par meaning, in fact, primarily 'mould' and only in the second place 'printing block', as was already clearly stated by Jäschke, it might have been possible to refute Laufer's etymology simply on semasiological grounds when he proposed to derive par from a Chinese word which in the first instance means 'board'. But though also the evidence of Mongolian lexicographers bears out the meaning of 'mould', we must look further afield in order to determine the etymology of par, attaching it to the 'word family' to which it belongs.

II. par in nems-par 'sinking and rising'

In the bSes-pa'i sprin-yig, the Tibetan translation of Nāgārjuna's Suhrilekha, which was twice included in the Tanjur, we meet with the following verse (No. 71):

\[
\text{rkañ-pa'i reg-pas nems-par bde bzod-pa/}
\text{lhun-po'i spo-la yun-riñ gnas-na ni/}
\]

1 See above, p. 72. The ju occurring in connexion with śīn-par (Thomas, op. cit., p. 130, n. 2) might perhaps be connected with āu in āu-dag 'correction', āu-č'en 'great corrector', which would confirm the meaning 'printing block' (rather than simply 'wooden mould') in the passage.

2 op. cit., p. 81: 'the wooden table or block to cut types on'.

3 See C. Jest, 'A technical note on the Tibetan method of block-carving', Man, LXI, No. 102, 1961, p. 84.

4 J. E. Kowalewski, Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français, III, Kazan, 1849, p. 2040, 'planche typographique de bois'.

5 The inclusion of Laufer's etymology s.v. bar in Professor F. D. Lessing's recent Mongolian-English dictionary, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1960, p. 82, may result in giving it another lease of life.

6 op. cit., II, 1846, p. 1092.

7 See H. Ui and others, Complete catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist canon, Sendai, 1934, Nos. 4182 and 4190.

8 The page references for the verse in question are as follows:

I Narthang Tanjur:
(a) mDo, vol. 33 (Gi), p. 67b².
(b) mDo, vol. 94 (Ne), pp. 283a²-283b¹.

II Tibetan Tripitaka:
(a) vol. 103, p. 215-3 (reproducing Peking Tanjur, mDo, vol. 33 (Gi), p. 78a²).
(b) vol. 129, p. 237-1 (reproducing Peking Tanjur, mDo, vol. 94 (Ne), p. 287a¹-²).
H. Wenzel, who translated the text both into German \(^1\) and into English,\(^2\) rendered this verse as follows: ‘After having dwelt for a long time on the summit of Meru, enjoying the pleasure of a ground that sinks and rises to the touch of the foot (i.e. is elastic)’. In supplying the word ‘ground’ (italicized by me) in his translation, Wenzel, as is evident from his German version, based himself on the entry *nems* in Jäschke’s dictionary, which it will be necessary to quote in full:

‘**Stg.** (Jäschke’s abbreviation of Tanjur) describes an elastic floor in the following manner: *rkañ-*pa *bzag-*na *ni* *nems* *ses* *byed-*de, *rkañ-*pa *btegs-*na *ni* *spar* *zes* *byed*: hence *nems*, it sinks a little, gives way.’ \(^3\)

Jäschke’s entry, but for the insertion of *ni* and the *de* after the first *byed* (where Sakaki supplies [−*pa*]) and the final *byed* (for which Sakaki writes *byed-*pa) is identical with two entries in the *Mahāvyutpatti*, which I shall now set out together with their Sanskrit and Chinese versions, and with the Japanese translation provided by Sakaki \(^4\):

\begin{verbatim}
6768 (503) Nikṣipte pade avanamati
rkañ-*pa *bzag-*na *nems* *ses* *byed-*pa

6769 (504) Utkṣipte pade unnamati
rkañ-*pa *btegs-*na *spar* *zes* *byed-*pa
\end{verbatim}

It will be noticed that Jäschke supplied the word ‘floor’ (obviously from the context), Wenzel changed that to ‘ground’, which latter word, or rather its Japanese equivalent *chi* 地, was also inserted by Sakaki. Parallel passages, some of which will be set out below, clearly show that the insertion was justified. But a serious difficulty remains. While the Tibetan version of the *Suhrulkha* has *nems* and *par*, Jäschke and Sakaki have *nems* and *spar*. To state the difficulty more specifically, *nems*, according to the latter two authorities, is contrasted by a word *spar* which clearly belongs with the verb *spar-ba* ‘to raise’ \(^5\) and here occurs in a context where, corresponding to Sanskrit *unnamati*,


\(^2\) ‘**Bces pa phrin yig** (“Friendly epistle”)’, *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1886 (see p. 20).

\(^3\) The *Dictionnaire thibetain-latin-français par les Missionnaires catholiques du Thibet*, generally referred to as ‘Desgodin’s dictionary’, Hongkong, 1899, p. 565, takes Jäschke’s entry over as follows: ‘*nems* (J.) *paululum sedere, s’asseoir, se reposer un peu (!)’.


\(^5\) An alternative form of *spor-ba*, see below, p. 78.
a word meaning 'rising' is to be expected. Nor is that all. Side by side with the types nems-par and nems-spar, we witness a third type, viz. nem-spar. This occurs in the Narthang edition 1 of the Mahāvyutpatti and, as Dr. F. R. Hamm had the kindness to inform me, also in the Derge and Coni editions.2 Though Sakaki’s edition is based on the Peking edition,3 it would seem from the reproduction of the passage in the Tibetan Tripiṭaka, which is rather blurred, that the Peking edition also has nem-spar, and Sakaki’s reading, perhaps under the influence of Jäschke’s dictionary, may turn out to be incorrect. The type nem-spar, though possibly suspect as being transmitted only in a lexicographic compilation of over 9,000 entries (adopting Sakaki’s numbering), can be supported by an actual text passage from the Tibetan version of the Yogacaryābhāmi, the rNal-bṣo byod-pa’i sa 4:


‘And the entire grounds of the Gods are as flat as the palm of your hand, without any elevation or depression. They are pleasant to the touch (of your foot). When you place your foot (on it), (the ground) will give way (sink). When you have lifted your foot, (the ground) rises (again)’.

Nevertheless,5 my contention is that spar is a mistake for par, which may have arisen through a wrong division of the compound nems-par as nem-spar, facilitated by the phrase nem-nem,6 denoting a ‘rocking motion’ and the causative snem-pa, both of which are, of course, cognates of nems. Ignoring the ‘compromise type’ (nems-spar), found in Jäschke and Sakaki, until we succeed in finding the actual text passage on which it is based, it must be repeated that spar is difficult to reconcile with the meaning of the passage (while par as a word meaning ‘rising’ fits in well also from the point of view of its etymology, as will be shown below). Furthermore, it must be pointed out that the spelling nems-par in our first passage is, in fact, well established as it occurs in each of the two places in the Tanjur in which the translation of the

---

1 Tanjur, mDo, vol. 123 (Go), p. 338a1.
2 Derge Tanjur, Ui’s Catalogue (see above, p. 74, n. 7), No. 4346, p. 96b3–4. The Coni Tanjur has, according to Dr. Hamm, as far as the Mahāvyutpatti is concerned, the same pagination as the Derge Tanjur.
4 Ui’s Catalogue, No. 4035. The page reference for the passage in question is as follows:
5 I wish to thank Mr. Richard S. Y. Ch’i for directing my attention to the Chinese version of this passage (Taishō Tripiṭaka, vol. 30, No. 1579, p. 298 b9–e0), which, however, shows certain differences.
6 cf. also the passage from the Abhidharma-kosā-tikā laksanānusāriṇī quoted p. 77, n. 7.
7 Kowalewski, op. cit., 11, p. 616, gives nem-nem as Tibetan equivalent of Mongol namuljāl, and nem-nem byed-pa as equivalent of Mongol namuljāgu. Lessing, op. cit., has s.v. namulazuu (p. 563) the example modun sola namulzamui ‘the wooden floor is shaking’.
Suhrllekha is to be found, both in the Narthang and Peking editions, which I was able to compare. The reading can also be confirmed by its occurrence in the commentary to the Suhrllekha, the bṣes-pa'i sprin-yig-gi rgya-c'er bṣad-pa ts'i gsal-ba (Vyaktapadā Suhrllekha-ṭīkā) which reads as follows:

\[ \text{rkaṅ-pa'i reg-pas nems-par bde bzod žes bya-ba ni rkaṅ-pa'i reg-pas nems žes byed-pa dañ/ par ces byed-pa'o.} \]

Finally, the reading nems-par can be adduced from a text passage which is quite independent of the Suhrllekha. This is to be found in the Tibetan translation of Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośabhāṣya, the C’os-mṇon-pa’i mdzod-kyi bṣad-pa, for which again the Narthang and Peking editions have been compared:

\[ \text{Sa-gzi de yaṅ śiṅ-bal-gyi 'dab-ma bzin-du reg-na 'jam-pa rkaṅ-pa bzag-pa dañ bteg-pa dag-gis na nems/ žes byed-pa dañ par žes byed-pa yod-do//} \]

(In L. de la Vallée Poussin’s translation, which is based on the Tibetan and Chinese texts, ‘Ce sol est doux au toucher, comme la feuille de l’arbre à coton : il monte et descend pour faciliter la marche ’.)

It will have been noticed that in all examples quoted we witness nems and par either as elements of a compound (as in nems-par bde in the Suhrllekha passage), or (in a manner reminiscent of Japanese to suru), in conjunction with žes (ces, ̄ses) and a form of byed. These occurrences, then, would not allow us to speak of a verb *par-ba ‘to rise’ (nor, for that matter, of a verb *nems-pa ‘to sink’). But there can be no doubt as to the occurrence of a word par in the meaning of ‘rising’ in at least three texts which belong to the Tibetan canonical literature.

III. par in par-gyis ’p’ar-ba ‘to jump up’

The phrase par-gyis ’p’ar-ba is included in Jäschke under ’p’ar-ba, which latter word he considers to be the neuter verb of spor-ba (spar-ba) ‘to lift up, raise, promote, advance’. Defining ’p’ar-ba as ‘to fly up, flash up, rebound, leap, bound, jump’, he indicates that he has found the phrase only in ‘native

1 Uí’s Catalogue, No. 4190. The page reference for the passage in question is as follows:

2 Uí’s Catalogue, No. 4090.


8 p. 356.
dictionaries’, and there apparently without an explanation, as he gives ‘prob(ably) the same as ‘p’ar-ba’ as the meaning. An exact definition occurs already in the Bod-kyi brda-yig rtogs-par sla-ba 1 (p. 86A), where it is explained as ogede debkerekü ‘to jump up’. Sumatriatna’s dictionary 2 not only provides us with the same Mongolian translation but also adds at the left and right of the Tibetan phrase two Sanskrit equivalents whose slightly corrupted garb (viz. utblatya and blapata) can without much difficulty be emended to utplutya 3 and plavate. The phrase par gyis ’p’ar has also been included in Nag-dbaṅ bsTan-dar’s Tibetan-Mongolian dictionary, the brDa-yig miñ-don gsal-bar byed-pa’i zla-ba’i od-snañ 4 (p. 68B 1), where we find a synonym of ogede ‘upward’ (degegsi debkerekü).

While the phrase would confirm the meaning of ‘rising’ for par, it fails to provide conclusive evidence as to the nominal or verbal character of the word. It must even be admitted that the suffix gyis when indicating an adverbial function appears more frequently after non-verbs (e.g. nian-gyis ‘slowly, gradually’, rim-gyis ‘gradually’, slad-kyis ‘afterwards’) than after verbs (e.g. nur-gyis ‘gradually’ from nur-ba ‘to change place, move a little’). A definite argument in favour of the assumption of a verb *par-ba ‘to rise, to project’ is, however, a striking parallelism in the semantic field between *par-ba and ’bur-ba, which will occupy us in IV. In addition we may find further evidence for the existence of a verb *par-ba ‘to rise, to project’ in the fact that it would constitute the true ‘verb neuter’ to spar-ba ‘to raise’, the alternative form 5 of spor-ba, mentioned above, though Jäsckhe, as we have seen, believed this function to be fulfilled by ’p’ar-ba, a verb of evidently more specific meanings than simply ‘to rise, to project’.6 From the etymological point of view *par-ba ‘to rise’ would, apart from ’bur-ba, spar-ba (spor-ba), and ’p’ar-ba, have further obvious cognates in ’p’ur-ba ‘to fly’ and its causative spur-ba ‘to make fly, to scare up, to let fly’, which latter verb Jäsckhe included in his dictionary on the authority of Csomá.

IV. *par-ba and ’bur-ba

As was mentioned before, there exists a striking parallelism in the semantic field between *par-ba ‘to rise, to project’ and ’bur-ba of the same meaning, and this would seem to provide the link between *par-ba ‘to rise’ and par ‘mould’ which it is necessary to establish. ’bur-du rko-ba ‘to emboss, work out

1 See Laufer’s ‘Skizze der mongolischen Literatur’, Keleti Szemle, VIII, 1907, 181.
3 cf. Mahanyouttäi (Sakaki), No. 6704 : utplutya : rgal-ba ‘am mc’ons.
5 The same vowel alternation can be observed in the case of spaṅ-ba by the side of spoṅ-ba, sprod-pa by the side of sprod-pa, and spyad-pa by the side of spyod-pa; cf. also spyāṅ-ba by the side of dpyaṅ-ba and spyāṅ-ba.
6 See above, p. 77.
relieves' recalls *par rko-ba 'to cut type' on the one hand, and *par-du 'debs-pa 'to print, stamp' on the other. There is even greater similarity between certain compounds with 'bur and par, as listed in Jäschke's dictionary: 'bur-rko-mk'an 'the engraver' exactly corresponds to *par-rko-mk'an 'the cutter of type', in like manner as 'bur-ma 'embossment, relieve' corresponds to *par-ma 'printed work, book'. The parallelism clearly shows that it is impossible to separate the assumed verb *par-ba 'to rise, project' from the noun par meaning 'mould' and 'printing block'. Any mould placed with its cavity downward on a surface conveys the idea of rising or projecting from this surface in the same manner as does the 'relieve' itself, which in its etymology, alike with German 'erhabene Arbeit', suggests this very idea. In having extended the idea of rising and projecting also to the 'printing block', which displays its script (apart from being in reverse) projecting in relief from its surface, the Tibetans may claim to have shown great originality and apparently induced the Mongolians to follow suit.

V. *dpar

It was probably merely due to an oversight on the part of I. J. Schmidt that an entry of, or rather a cross reference from, *dpar was not included in his dictionary (which would also have secured it an entry in Jäschke's dictionary). For *dpar is listed in one of the three Tibetan-Mongolian dictionaries which Schmidt, according to his preface, had abstracted before he had access to Csoma's dictionary. The dictionary in question is, to use Schmidt's abbreviated title (which is also given on the margin of each folio of the work), the Nyi 'od, which constitutes the third part of the Min-gi rgya-mt'so. *dpar is equated there (p. 46A) with keb. The same equation, enlarged by the example *dpar rgyab (rendered as keb daruqu), is to be found in Sumatiratna's dictionary (in which this spelling has also been used in its recent colophon). *dpar occurs in the same Tun-huang MS in which we have witnessed sin-par, and Thomas considers the possibility of equating it with par. I am unable to give any further reference to actual texts beyond the legend mentioned by Laufer.

VI. *spar

The occurrence of *spar in a Tun-huang MS, which was included by Thomas in an 'Addendum', is doubtful both as to spelling and meaning. *spar 'printing block' occurs less frequently than par. It may perhaps be explained as the thing 'raised' into relief, instead of the thing 'rising' into relief. We witness *spar,  

---

1 The two others are the Bod-kyi brda-yig rogs-par sla-ba, mentioned above (p. 78), and the ' Four language mirror ' (Yuh-yih syhtsi chingwenjiana 御制四體清文鑑).
2 See Heissig, op. cit., p. 43, No. 47. The full Tibetan title, not quoted there, is: Dag-yig c'u-ka gdul-byi's snyi'h mun sel-byed nyi-ma srok-gi' od.
3 Heissig, op. cit., p. 43, No. 45.
4 op. cit., p. 133, n. 7.
5 See above, p. 72.
6 op. cit., p. 143, 1 a 3.
not par in the ‘Five language mirror’,\(^1\) which is now easily accessible in the Peking reprint of 1957 and, owing to its continuous pagination, can be quoted more conveniently than the ‘Four language mirror’, with which, but for the addition of the East Turki language, it is most likely identical. spar occurs there both in the meaning of ‘mould’ (p. 3077, where it renders Manchu dururi) and as a neologism for the ‘eight hexagrams’, ba guah 八卦\(^2\) (p. 4605), previously rendered as p’i’yag rgya (p. 754). The ‘Palace Printing Office’ is rendered as yig-spar-gsags (p. 4697) where spar may perhaps be interpreted as a verb, as we shall see. spar (not par) is given as the ‘literary Eastern Tibetan reading’ in the Eastern Tibetan dictionary and study of the Eastern Tibetan language, edited by Minoru Gō and others,\(^3\) where spar-pa (apparently a misprint for spar-ba) ‘to print’ is listed as No. 2187 (with the pronunciation par-wa). This would accord with the use of spar-ba as a verb in the meaning of ‘to print’ in the colophon of the ‘Four language edition’ of the ‘Sutra of forty-two sections’\(^4\) (Syhshyrell jang jing 四十二章經), side by side with its use as a noun ‘a print’: skad bzi spar bsgrubs-te ci loogs sīg sbar (for spar) nas ‘after preparing the four language print and, as far as possible, printing it’. The ‘Tibetan-Tibetan dictionary’ by dGe-bs”es C’os-kyi Grags-pa (brDa-dag min-ts’ig gsal-ba), recently republished with a Chinese translation,\(^5\) explains (p. 506) the phrase spar dgos (second meaning) as par rgyag dgos, which has been translated into Chinese as shiu yinnshua 須 印 創. In the same way spar and spor gnaḥ are explained as imperatives with the meaning ‘print!’ (p. 510). It is therefore possible that the above-mentioned Tibetan term for ‘Palace Printing Office’ may be a literal translation of Shua shu tzuoh 劃書作 (Manchu: .Bithe suwaselara falga).\(^6\)

Tibetan par, as well as its two derivatives dpar and spar must, then, be regarded as genuine Tibetan words. par, occurring in its basic meaning of ‘rising’ in Tibetan canonical literature, aptly describes ‘mould’ and ‘printing block’ as a kind of ‘relievo’, thereby recalling the similar semantic development of the synonymous ‘bur’ ‘to rise’. It also fits in well with other Tibetan words like ‘p’ur-ba ‘to fly’, ‘p’ar-ba ‘to fly up, jump’, etc., in conjunction with which it may be said to constitute a ‘word family’.

\(^1\) (Yuh-ji)wuulii chingwenjiann 御制五體清文鑑.
\(^2\) The Chinese compound entered the Tibetan language also as a loan-word (spar k’a), see Laufer, ‘Loan-words in Tibetan’, TP, xvii, 1916, p. 509, No. 230.
\(^3\) Okayama, 1954.
\(^6\) cf. E. Hauer, Handwörterbuch der Mandschusprache, 1952, p. 99, who refers to the Chingwen-busuhuey for this term, which he translates as ‘Hofbuchdruckerei’. suwaselambi (from Chinese shua [for yinnshua]) is an obvious Manchu neologism.