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On the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the  
_Pramāṇaviniścaya_  
A look into the translator’s workshop of rNog Bladon šes rab

Pascale Hugon, Vienna

**Introduction**

The contribution of rNog Bladon šes rab (1059–1109) (hereafter: rNog Lo) to the developments of Buddhist scholarship in general at the beginning of the Later Diffusion of Buddhism in Tibet (phyi dar) is a highly significant one. In the field of epistemology in particular rNog Lo’s translations and commentarial works constituted the corner stones for the emergence of a leading tradition of Tibetan tshad ma at the monastery of gSaṅ phu Ne’u thog.²

Tibetan epistemologists in rNog Lo’s time and the generations that followed up to the thirteenth century used the _Pramāṇaviniścaya_ (PVin) by Dharmakīrti (7th c. or 6th c. according to Krasser 2012) as

---

¹ The work on this paper has been generously supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) in the context of the Project P23422-G15 “Early bKa’ gdam pa scholasticism.” Part of the material was gathered in the course of the FWF-Project P19862 “Philosophische und religiöse Literatur des Buddhismus.” This paper elaborates on the results presented at the Panel on Sanskrit Manuscripts at the Fifth Beijing International Seminar on Tibetan Studies held at the China Tibetology Research Center, Beijing, China, from August 1–5, 2012. Part I was the object of a pre-publication in the journal _China Tibetology_. I am grateful to the participants of the panel for their useful feedback. Thank you also to Katharine Apostle for reviewing my English.

² On rNog Lo’s life and works see Kramer 2007.

Horst Lasic, Xuezhu Li (eds.), _Sanskrit manuscripts in China II. Proceedings of a panel at the 2012 Beijing Seminar on Tibetan Studies, August 1 to 5._ Beijing 2016, pp. 49–114.
their main source.\(^3\) The translation of this text preserved in the Tibetan canon was carried out by rNog Lo, Parahitabhadra and anonymous “others” while rNog Lo was residing in Kashmir between 1076 and 1093. The same team also translated the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* by Dharmottara (8th c.) (PVinṬ).\(^4\) A concurrent translation of the PVin existed of which we find traces in the citations of the PVin in Jñānaśrībhadra’s commentary, which dates from the 11th c. The way the PVin is translated in these citations is very different from the canonical translation. According to a source this translation was, like the translation of Jñānaśrībhadra’s own commentary, the deed of Jñānaśrībhadra himself together with Khyuṅ po Chos kyi brtson ’grus.\(^5\) More research will be necessary to ascertain whether it had any impact.\(^6\)

rNog Lo’s Tibetan translation of the PVin and PVinṬ became the original by proxy for most Tibetan thinkers who did not rely on the Sanskrit version of the text. Modern scholars, for lack of an-

---

\(^3\) Cf. van der Kuijp 1989.

\(^4\) This attribution is made in the colophon of the canonical versions (cf. Kramer 2007: 63 and 66). rNog Lo’s biography by Gro lung pa confirms this information (ibid., p. 103–104). The colophon groups the “others” with Parahitabhadra (*pañḍita gzan la phan pa bzaṅ po la sogs pa daṅ / bod kyi lo tsā ba blo ldan šes rab*), suggesting that they were members of the Kashmirian part of the translating team rather than Tibetan scholars or students. With no intention of downplaying the role Parahitabhadra and the anonymous “others” had in this task, I refer for simplicity’s sake to this translation as “rNog Lo’s translation” throughout the rest of the paper.

\(^5\) Van der Kuijp 1989: 19 gives this information based on the *Myaṅ yul stod smad bar gsum gi no mtshar gtam gi legs bsdad mkhas pa’i ’jug ŋogs*, a work questionably attributed to Tāranātha.

\(^6\) In this regard I examined in particular the commentary on the PVin by Chu mig pa, who was an abbot of gSaṅ phu in the 13th c. First referred to in van der Kuijp 1993: 295–296, this text has now been published in the *bKa’ gdams gsuṅ ’bum*, vol. 87, 5–307. Chu mig pa indicates in the colophon of this work that he knew Jñānaśrībhadra’s commentary. My examination of Chu mig pa’s citations of the PVin is yet far from being exhaustive, but the passages I considered hint in the direction of rNog Lo’s translation rather than that used by Jñānaśrī.
other way, also relied on this Tibetan translation for the study of this fundamental source until the fortunate surfacing of Sanskrit manuscripts of these texts. The availability of the Sanskrit version of the PVin and PVinT now enables a detailed comparison with the Tibetan translation. While this comparison confirms the high quality of rṅog Lo’s translation, it also discloses a number of differences. As far as it could be assessed by the editors of the third chapter of the PVin, there are few cases that qualify as “major divergences” in the strong sense once transmission mistakes have been discarded. This speaks in favor of a careful preservation of Dharmakīrti’s text and of the translator’s competence. There remain, however, a number of variations and unexpected translations that deserve to be examined.

Part I of this paper focuses on preliminary methodological issues pertaining to the comparison of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions. We must indeed first clearly determine what we are comparing before we can draw any conclusion on the work of the translator. In the first section, I review the extant material and show that the “ideal comparands” are not available to us. In the second section, I attempt to retrieve some of rṅog Lo’s original translation by relying on newly recovered Tibetan commentaries on the PVin. In Part II, I discuss the factors responsible for the differences between the Sanskrit and the Tibetan, highlighting among other things the significant input of the translator as an interpreter. I hope thereby to be able to bring to the fore additional aspects of the translating technique of the rṅog Lo, the “Great translator,” a topic for which Lasic already set some corner stones in his study of the Nyāyabinduṭīkā.⁷

⁷ See Lasic 2006, which deals with fragments of the Nyāyabinduṭīkā translation preserved in Tabo Monastery, and Lasic 2007 on fragments of an old Nyāyabindu translation from Dunhuang. Lasic’s studies reveal in particular rṅog Lo’s priorities about the execution of a revisional work, since his translation of the Nyāyabinduṭīkā relied on an earlier translation by Dharmāloka. Lasic (2006: 76) shows that rṅog Lo’s main concerns were (1) to improve the technical terminology and (2) to better represent the structure of the Sanskrit text. In the case of the Nyāyabindu, Lasic (2007: 491) concludes that “we can without hesitation exclude that the canonical version is a new translation by Blo ldan śes rab.” He notes that the canoni-
Although my discussion concentrates on rNog Lo’s translation of the PVin and PVinṬ, I trust that the questions raised in both parts of the paper are similarly applicable to a broader corpus and can contribute to our understanding of commentarial techniques and issues linked with text transmission on a larger scale.

Part I — Methodological considerations

1. What are we comparing?

Ideally, a comparison of the original Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation aimed at assessing the translator’s contribution should take as comparands (1) the Sanskrit text in the version as it was known to the translator and (2) the Tibetan text as it was established by the translator. In the present case (as for most texts in the context considered) this turns out to be problematic.

(1) The Sanskrit text

PVin

The Sanskrit material of the PVin currently at our disposal consists of two complete and three incomplete manuscripts, plus a folio from a sixth manuscript.8 Features of this material such as recognizable typical scribal mistakes, notably eye-skip errors, indicate that none of these manuscripts qualify as what I call a first-generation manuscript, that is, either an autograph by Dharmakīrti himself, or an exemplar of the work written down under Dharmakīrti’s dictation. The absence of a first-generation manuscript is not excessively problematic for our purpose. Indeed, it is likely that rNog Lo, who

8 On this material see Steinkellner’s introduction to the edition of PVin 1 and 2 and the introduction to the edition of PVin 3 by Hugon and Tomabechi.
lived several centuries after Dharmakīrti, did not have such material at his disposal either but, like us, had access to a later copy. Which version of the text did he rely on? How similar was it to the Sanskrit versions available to us?

The manuscripts of the PVin at our disposal suggest that the text was well preserved. Once scribal mistakes have been excluded, most of the remaining variants between them do not involve a significant change of meaning – the available Tibetan translation can in these cases indifferently reflect either one or the other Sanskrit reading.

At the risk of anticipating our conclusions pertaining to the suitable comparand for the Tibetan version, we can observe an overall correspondence of the Tibetan translation preserved in the canon with the Sanskrit version of the text in these manuscripts. This indicates that rṅog Lo’s Sanskrit source was not exceedingly different. There are no notable additions, lacks or changes in the location of extended portions of text. The variations (to be investigated in Part II) are all local, usually restricted to a single word.

Could rṅog Lo’s source have been one of the manuscripts available to us? The Tibetan translation preserved in the canon does not side unilaterally with any of our five later-generation manuscripts taken individually. And among the variants, there are separative readings that hint at the translator’s reliance on a version of the text that is different from these five.⁹

⁹ See Steinkellner’s introduction to PVin 1&2: xxxix and Tomabechi and Hugon’s introduction to PVin 3: xxxiv–xxxvi. Steinkellner (PVin 1&2: xxxix) notably mentions (i) a case in the first chapter where manuscripts ABC share the mistaken reading viśeṣajñāṇāviśeṣād (probably due to an eye-skip error), whereas the Tibetan (khyad par gyi šes pa daṅ khyad par can gyi šes pa khyad par med pa’i phyir) supports the correct reading viṣeṣa jñānaviśeṣajñāṇāviśeṣād, and (ii) the presence in the Tibetan of the phrase de daṅ bral bā’o, which cannot be interpreted as a gloss, whereas all the available manuscripts omit *tayā rahitam. Steinkellner’s discussion assumes the pertinence of the canonical version of the Tibetan translation as a comparand.
But we cannot simply assume that the Sanskrit comparand, rNog Lo’s source, is a later-generation copy different from ours. Indeed, we lack information not only on the sources, but also on the actual process of translation involved. We do not know whether rNog Lo and his team relied on one or several versions of the text, nor whether their source was written or memorized, or a combination of both. Further, we do not know what their “editorial policy” was: how did they proceed in the event of illegible portions, scribal or mnemonic corruptions, variants, etc.? What amount of emendations did they apply before proceeding to translate? Assuming that Parahitabhadra and rNog Lo were accomplished thinkers, a likely hypothesis would be that they made informed choices and corrected whatever material was at their disposal when they felt it was necessary. From this angle, even part of the separative readings mentioned above may be viewed as the product of expert editorial work based on faulty manuscripts.

PVinṬ

If we look for an ideal comparand for the PVinṬ, we meet with the same issues but this time on two levels:

First, we lack information about Dharmottara’s source and editorial policy when he composed his commentary. A single (incom-

---

10 In the colophon of some translations revised by rNog Lo one finds mention of the use of exemplars of the text. For instance, the colophon of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā specifies that rNog Lo used exemplars of the text from Kashmir and Magadha that were ‘collected’ (bsags) (or maybe one should understand it as ‘collated’?) (kha che’i dpe dan yul dbus kyi dpe dum bsags nas gan la phabs pa) (Kramer 2007: 53–54). The Nyāyabinduṭīkā was revised based on an exemplar from Magadha (ibid., p. 66–67).

11 In particular Steinkellner’s (i) (see the note 9) and possibly the one mentioned by Hugon and Tomabechi (discussed in Part II.3 [5]). It is less likely in the case of Steinkellner’s (ii) that the translators would have emended the text without relying on an alternative Sanskrit version.

12 On this topic, see Freschi (2015), where the example of Dharmottara is discussed as an illustration of a problem that affects the broader context of
On the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the Pramanaviniścaya

The complete manuscript of the PVinṬ is currently available, which bears the mark of being a copy (numerous scribal mistakes of all kinds attest to this). Comparing this version with the extant manuscripts of the PVin, we can see that Dharmottara includes words and expressions from the PVin in three different ways: (i) explicit quotations with a lexical mark (followed by *iti*); (ii) explicit quotations without a lexical mark (when explaining a word by giving a synonym; in such a case, the Tibetan has the mark *te/ste/de*); (iii) embedding words in his explanation.

The first type amounts to a verbatim citation of the source text. The same is true for the second type but only the root of the word is representative of the source text because it is often part of an expression or compound that is being explained. The third type is only recognizable when one refers to the source text. In this regard the Tibetan might be misleading due to its lack of certain nuances; thus an identical expression in the source text and in the commentary in Tibetan does not necessarily indicate that the Sanskrit versions of the PVin and PVinṬ have matching expressions.

Example

Source text: PVinSkt 1.2–3 (prose passage on PVin 3.1ab); PVinT D187a7–b1; P285a7–8

13 In this regard Steinkellner (1988: 106–107) points out the lack of precision that can follow from working with texts exclusively available in Tibetan.

14 “Inference for others is the statement of the triply characterized reason by [a proponent] wishing to generate in [the mind of] another, on the basis of a triply characterized reason, an understanding of that which possesses the reason, [an understanding] just like the understanding of that which possesses the reason which arose in his own [mind] on the basis of the triply characterized reason.” (Adapted from the translation of PSV in Tillemans 2000: 3–4)
yathaiva hi svayaṃ trirūpāl liṅgāl liṅgini jñānam utpannam, tathā parātra liṅgijñānotpipādayisāyā trirūpalingākhyānam parārtham anumānam

ji ltar raṅ niś tshul gsum pa’i rtags las rtags can la (P las) śes pa skyes pa kho na ltar gζan la rtags can gyi śes pa bskyed par ’dod pas tshul gsum pa’i rtags (P rtag) ston par byed pa ni gζan gyi don gyi rjes su dpag pa ste

Dharmottara’s commentary: PVinT_{skt} 1b4–6 (reading of the manuscript); PVinT_{T} D2a1–3; P2b1–3

I use the following marking:

Explicit quotations with a mark
Explicit quotations without a mark
Embedded words from the PVin

yathaiva hīti |
yathaiva yenaivārthakrameṇa trirūpāt trīṇi rūpāṃ yasya tasmāl liṅgini parokṣe ’ṛthe ātmano jñānam utpannam tathā tesaivarthakrameṇa parātra parasāntāne liṅgino ’ṛhasya yaj jñānam tasyotpipādayisāyā trirūpa-liṅgasya yad ākhyānam prakāśanāṃ tat parārtham anumānam

ji ltar raṅ niś ces smos te |
ji ltar te don gyi tshul gaṅ gis tshul gsum pa ste | tshul gsum gaṅ la yod pa’i rtags de las rtags can lkog tu gyur pa’i don la bdag niś sēs pa bskyed pa de kho na ltar te | don gyi rim pa de niś kyis gζan la ste rgyud gζan dag la rtags can gyi don gyi sēs pa gaṅ yin pa de bskyed par ’dod pas tshul gsum pa’i rtags ston par byed pa ste | gsal bar byed pa gaṅ yin pa de ni gζan gyi don gyi rjes su dpag pa yin no ||

a Note the difference of translation: here don gyi tshul renders arthakrama but in the correlative one finds don gyi rim pa for arthakrama.

The examination of explicit quotations for the third chapter did not reveal significant differences with the text of the PVin based on our manuscripts. When the two complete manuscripts showed divergent readings, our manuscript of Dharmottara’s text supported each of them against the other in equivalent proportions.₁₅ Dharmottara’s source thus did not appear to have sided unilaterally with one of the versions of the PVin at our disposal. It may be that Dharmottara had

₁₅ See the introduction to the edition of PVin 3, p. xxxvii.
access to another version, or that he relied on several versions and chose from the variants on a case-to-case basis.

On the second level, we meet again with the question of the translators’ source when translating the PVinṬ. If rNgol Lo’s team relied on a single manuscript, it was probably not the one at our disposal. Indeed we can point out several separative cases that are more conclusive than in the case of the PVin. Notably, the canonical versions of the PVinṬ (so far D and P have been consulted) lack a translation for phrases present in our Sanskrit exemplar. Since these phrases are sometimes quite long and such lacks are not rare, I would exclude the possibility that all these omissions are the result of scribal oversights. Conversely, there are sentences in Tibetan where our Sanskrit exemplar does not have any equivalent. Further study of the PVinṬ will show whether some of them could be glosses by rNgol Lo himself or by a revisor, or notes by a reader included by a copyist. But there are cases that hint to the existence of an alternative Sanskrit source where these sentences are present. Other cases suggest another manuscript with a variant reading.

---

16 For example: *etad uktaṃ bhavati na vayam brūma ekatavyāṇekatvam avasyam eva tu brūmo nekatavyāṃtasya sambhave vyāpakasambhava esitavyo vyāpakābhāv(o)e <vā> vyāpyābhāva iti* (PVinṬSk 8a3–4); *so rthas tat-sāmarthyena vyāptas* (PVinṬSk 17b2); *dvayoś ca bhōjanatīvatīviśeṣayōḥ pratiśedhāḥ* (PVinṬSk 19a6); *asparśatāvasya hy antyayo vya[ti]rekasahāyah* | (PVinṬSk 103a3); the expressions *gamayan* and *nānyatheti* in the Tibetan translation of the sentence *hetur vipakṣavyāvṛttiṃ gamayantī prakṛtasya sādyasya gamako bhavati nānyatheti sēaiḥ pakṣadharmmair ayam arthaḥ kathyate* | (PVinṬSk 71b5; PVinṬT D75b45, P89a6–7: phyogs kyi chos ‘di rnam gyis ni mthun pa’i phyogs las ldog pa dañ ldan pa’i gtsang ni skabs su bab pa’i bsgrub bya go bar byed pa yin no ṇes bya bai don ’di brjod pa yin no ||).

17 For instance, the phrase *de ltar ’gyur gyi ṇes bya ba ni grub par ’gyur gyi’o || (PVinṬT D22a7; P25b7)*, which refers to *evam svāt in PVinSk 174*; or *gcig rnam par gcad pa ’nid gnas pa yin pa’i phyir | mīn bya ’nid go byed du ’gyur ro || (PVinṬD71a5).*

18 For instance, the translation *gal te de ltar yin na ṇes bya ba ni the tshom med pa’i phyir ro || (PVinṬT D10a2; P11b7) for yadi evam iti sandehena-bhidhānā[va]d iti || (PVinSk 9a6), which suggests that the translator read *sandeḥābhāvād.*
But as in the case of the translation of the PVin, it is possible that the translators used several sources and chose from one or the other or adopted an emended version on a case-to-case basis. An additional question concerns their editorial policy when their version(s) of the PVinṭ presented a variant with their version(s) of the PVin.

(2) The Tibetan text

When modern scholars speak of rNog Lo’s Tibetan translation of the PVin or the PVinṭ, they usually refer to the version of these texts that was preserved in the canonical bsTan ’gyur collections of sNar thang, sDe dge, Co ne or Peking, or the compilation (dpe sdur ma) of these four recently published in Beijing (1994–2008: kruṅ go’i bod rig pa’i dpe skrun khaṇ). Paul Harrison summarizes the constitution of the bsTan ’gyur collections as follows:¹⁹

The transmission of the bsTan ’gyur which was also compiled at the beginning of the fourteenth century at sNar thang has been considerably less complicated. To the best of my knowledge, there are five complete editions in existence, all of which apparently go back to Bu ston’s substantial revision of the Old sNar thang bsTan ’gyur at Zha lu in 1334. The woodblock prints made in Peking (1724) and sNar thang (1741–1742) are both based on the second enlarged copy of Bu ston’s edition made in 1688 at ’Phying ba sTag rtse by the regent Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho. This consisted of 224 volumes, and included over 200 texts translated or discovered since Bu ston’s time [...]. There is also a Golden Manuscript bsTan ’gyur, recently published in Beijing, which is possibly an offspring of the 1724 Peking print. On the other hand, the sDe dge woodblock edition of the bsTan ’gyur (1737–1744) was compiled using a number of manuscripts, some if not all of which were derived from the Zha lu edition [...], but it preserves an earlier stage in the development of the tradition: even though it was subsequently enlarged from 209 to 214 volumes, it contains far fewer

On the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*

All the canonical versions are the result of a complex process of text transmission, compilation and editorial work, and the earliest canonical collection was completed two and a half centuries after rNog Lo’s translation. The canonical versions of the PVin and PVinṬ are thus not representative of a “first-generation translation,” that is, the Tibetan text as it was established by rNog Lo in Kashmir, or even of the text established by rNog Lo after subsequent revision of the initial translation.

Old individual manuscripts of the text might bring us a step closer to the original translation. But if they are copies, one must reckon with scribal mistakes, such as omissions or substitution of terms, mistakes that are not automatically identifiable as corruptions of the text being copied (in the way typos and dittos are). In addition, whether their colophon says so or not, these old versions may involve some editorial input and are thus not necessarily mere copies of the original translation.\(^{20}\)

To summarize, our ideal Sanskrit comparand, the translator’s source, might not be a unique manuscript — and if it is, it is not available to us at present — but a kind of “critical edition” to which we do not have direct access. And our ideal Tibetan comparand is also not available to us; we only have access to later-generation material that does not result from a vertical transmission by way of

\(^{20}\) Van der Kuijp (1994: 1-3) describes, for instance, a 110-folio manuscript of the PVin in cursive script (*dbu med*) preserved at the Tibetan Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing (catalogue no. 004780[1]). A postscript written below the colophon of this manuscript specifies that the text at hand is an edited version of rNog Lo’s translation. Van der Kuijp identifies the editor — who is referred to as “sTag sde pa” in an interlinear note — as the thirteenth-century sTag sde pa Seṅ ge rgyal mtshan (1212–1294).
successive copies of the first-generation translation. However there may be some hope of getting closer to rNog Lo’s original version.

2. Attempting to retrieve the first-generation translation of the PVin

The surfacing of rNog Lo’s commentarial work on the PVin, the dKa’ gnas, appears to offer a promising way to palliate, at least to a certain point, the lack of an integral first-generation exemplar of the translation. Indeed, as can be expected in a commentary, rNog Lo frequently quotes words from the PVin in this work. It makes sense to surmise that he is citing the Tibetan version according to the translation that he himself produced. Other Tibetan commentaries on the PVin by authors linked to the monastery of gSañ phu (of which rNog Lo was the second abbot) are also of interest in this regard, because it is quite likely that their authors knew rNog Lo’s translation.

In order to assess the contribution this newly recovered material can make to retrieving rNog Lo’s first-generation translation, I have collected all the explicit quotations of words from PVin 3 in rNog Lo’s dKa’ gnas (a selective commentary on the PVin), Phya pa’s ’Od zer (an extensive commentary on the PVin) and bsDus don (a synoptic table of the PVin), and gTsañ nag pa’s bsDus pa (an extensive commentary on the PVin). I have then confronted them with the reading found in the D and P bsTan’ gyur.

2.1 Words cited as “markers”

A first observation is that the majority of the explicit quotations from PVin 3 in these works have the specific function of being a “marker.” Namely, they point to a specific sentence or paragraph in the source text by way of indicating its first (sometimes also last) words. For example, this would amount to referring to §2 of the present paper by saying “[In the paragraph starting with the words] ‘The surfacing.’” If not indicated explicitly, the end of the passage that is pointed to can be understood implicitly in view of the content of the explanation or can be inferred by the quotation of the next marker, especially when the
commentary bears on the totality of the source text. In the \textit{dKa’ gnas}, only parts of the PVin are explained. But Phya pa’s \textit{bsDus don} carries out a full hierarchical organization of the PVin: the text is divided into more than 1200 portions (sometimes of the length of one sentence or less), and each of them is referred to by such a marker.\footnote{On this text see Hugon 2009a and 2009b.}

The use of quotations as markers has a negative and a positive consequence for our purpose:

The negative aspect is that the words cited in this way provide us with an extremely partial access to the original translation (only one expression per subdivision). Further, the words cited in this aim instantiate parts of the text that are in most cases far from being crucial. Indeed, countless paragraphs start with “then,” “therefore,” or “in this regard” (\textit{de nas, de’i phyir, de la...}).

On a more optimistic note, these markers imply the existence of a specific version of the translation shared by the author of the commentary and his intended readership. Otherwise indeed a reader would not be able to figure out which division of the text is being explained — it would be like trying to locate a chapter in a book by referring to the page numbers in the table of contents of this book in a different edition. It is thus also likely that the author was careful to accurately reproduce the words cited. While the difference between “here” (\textit{’di la}) and “there” (\textit{de la}) might not matter much for the understanding of a passage, such a difference does matter when the expression is cited as a marker. This remark, however, holds true only for the very first word cited. In the (less frequent) case of longer expressions used as markers, the author of the commentary could afford to be less careful with the subsequent words because they are no longer decisive for identifying the passage being discussed.

A variation of markers given in different commentaries that discuss the same topic can be explained in various ways: commentators may have divided the root text in different ways\footnote{On this topic see Hugon 2009a: 65ff.}; they may have adopted the same divisions of the root text but relied on translations...
in which these particular words only vary; or they may have relied on completely different translations. Yet another possibility, which as we will see below is frequently met with, is that the variation may have been caused by a careless copyist.

2.2 Classification of variants

My comparative analysis of all the markers collected from the texts mentioned above has not revealed cases that indicate the use of a substantially dissimilar translation in which the whole syntax of the sentence would be different. There is an overall correspondence also in the way these authors divide the root text. The variants of markers and other citations of words of the PVin due to the translation can be classified in the following categories:

2.2.1 Variants due to corruption

Most variants can be identified as the result of a corrupt transmission of the text. Such mistakes are well known by scholars who rely on the canonical versions. The other texts considered here are all extant as single manuscripts with the exception of the dKa’ gnas, for which there are two manuscripts and a modern edition based on one of them. All these texts bear the stigmata of the copying process. Copying mistakes also affect citations, including markers. For the latter I am more prone to attribute these mistakes to scribes and copyists than to postulate carelessness on the part of the author for the reason indicated in §2.1.

The devil’s advocate may ask how, apart from grammatically or orthographically incorrect Tibetan expressions, one may safely classify a variant as a copying mistake and not as the result of a translation based on a different Sanskrit version. The hypothesis that the Sanskrit text of the PVin was well preserved in the course of its transmission, confidence in the competence of the translator together with a dose of good judgment and editorial expertise allows one to make such a decision with a safe degree of certainty in the majority of cases. Here are some examples:
(a) Faulty readings in the dKa’ gnas

There are numerous cases where a copying mistake affects only one of the two manuscripts while the other retains a correct reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dKa’ gnas 380,4–5; Ms A 93a6</th>
<th>rgyu las ’bras bu btags pa’i phyir ro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dKa’ gnas Ms B 104a3</td>
<td>rgyu la ’bras bu btags pa’i phyir ro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reading of Ms B is supported by

| PVinSkt 1,3–4               | kāraṇe kāryopacārāt               |
| ‘Od zer 143b7              | rgyu la ’bras bu btags pa’i phyir ro |
| PVin\(_t\) D187b1; P285a8  | rgyu la ’bras bu btags (P btags) pa’i phyir ro |

The confusion of la and las is a frequent scribal mistake.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dKa’ gnas 437,12; Ms A 106b3</th>
<th>don rnam par dgag par mi nus pa’i phyir ro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dKa’ gnas Ms B 118b3</td>
<td>don rnam la dgag par mi nus pa’i phyir ro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reading of Ms B is supported by

| PVinSkt 35,5                 | ‘ṛtheṣv aśakyapratisedhavād            |
| ‘Od zer 171a1               | don rnam la dgag par mi nus pa’i phyir ro |
| PVin\(_t\) D198b4; P296b2   | don rnam la dgag par mi nus pa’i phyir ro |

The mistake can be explained by a resemblance of the characters involved in cursive script.

The modern edition itself is not exempt of copying mistakes. For instance:

| dKa’ gnas 401,6              | de ni ji ltar |
| dKa’ gnas Ms A 98a5         | da ni ji ltar |

The reading of Ms A is supported by

<p>| PVinSkt 12,1                | katham idānīm aśrūyamāṇaḥ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$dKa,' gnas$ Ms B 108b7</td>
<td>da ni ji ltar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$'Od zer$ 154a2</td>
<td>da ni ji ltar ma thos na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVin$_t$, D190b4; P288b3</td>
<td>da ni ji ltar ma thos na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Faulty readings in the $'Od zer$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$'Od zer$ 187b1</td>
<td>de ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVin$_{Skt}$ 82,10</td>
<td>tatra hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$dKa,' gnas$ 491,13</td>
<td>de la ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$bsDus pa$ 198a5</td>
<td>de la ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVin$_t$, D213a4, P319b7</td>
<td>de la ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission of $la$, or copying mistake of $der$.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$'Od zer$ 186a7</td>
<td>'di gañ žig mi mthun phyogs su gtogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVin$_{Skt}$ 78,1</td>
<td>kaṃ punar $atra$ bhavān vipakṣaṃ pratyeti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$bsDus pa$ 197b5</td>
<td>$'dir$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVin$_t$, D211b7; P309b2</td>
<td>'dir gañ žig mi mthun pa'i phyogs su gtogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission of $dir$.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Faulty readings in the $bsDus don$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$bsDus don$ 12a4</td>
<td>de ci ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVin$_{Skt}$ 102,6</td>
<td>tat kim $idānīṁ$ pakṣo 'pi vipa-kṣaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$'Od zer$ 191a5</td>
<td>de ci $da$ ni phyogs kyaṅ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVin$_t$, D218b4; P316b5</td>
<td>de ci $da$ ni phyogs kyaṅ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission of $da$.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit Version</th>
<th>Tibetan Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bsDus don</em> 12a4</td>
<td>gañ la skyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVIn\textsubscript{Skt} 102,8–9</td>
<td>na ca hetoh sambandhopedarśana-nakāle pakṣādvikalpo 'sti, yato 'yam doṣah syāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Od zer 191a8</td>
<td>gañ las skyon 'dir 'gyur ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bsDus pa</em> 202a8</td>
<td>gañ las</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVIn\textsubscript{T} D218b5; P316b6–7</td>
<td>gañ las skyon 'dir 'gyur ba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confusion of la and las.

### (d) Faulty readings in the *bsDus pa*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit Version</th>
<th>Tibetan Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bsDus pa</em> 206a4</td>
<td>dañ ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVIn\textsubscript{Skt} 123,11</td>
<td>kim idānīṃ nairātmyād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVIn\textsubscript{T} D225b5; P332b4</td>
<td>da ni bdag med pa las</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly confusion of a tsheg for a final -ṅ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit Version</th>
<th>Tibetan Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bsDus pa</em> 166b1</td>
<td>yid pa’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVIn\textsubscript{Skt} 3,8</td>
<td>san khalv apy arthaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVIn\textsubscript{T} D188a2; P286a2</td>
<td>yod pa’i don ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Here the scribal mistake can be explained by the occurrence of the expression blo yid spyod las earlier in the sentence in the <em>bsDus pa</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit Version</th>
<th>Tibetan Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bsDus pa</em> 201a2</td>
<td>de raṅ yaṅ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVIn\textsubscript{Skt} 92,10</td>
<td>tatrāpi hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVIn\textsubscript{T} D215b7; P313b3</td>
<td>der yaṅ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mistake can possibly be explained by a confusion of a *tsheg* with *ra* or *-ṅ* and the proximity of the expression *gzan dag*.

(e) Faulty readings in the canon

The availability of these earlier texts, together with that of the Sanskrit version, offers strong support to correcting faulty readings in the canon.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PVin,r D193a2; P291a2</th>
<th>de’i phyir chos <em>'ga' żig</em> kho na but PVin,Skt 18,9</th>
<th>tasmāt <em>kevala</em> eva dharmo dKa’ gnas 480,21–481,1</th>
<th>rnam ņes ’di īṇid</th>
<th>de’i phyir chos <em>‘ba’ żig</em> kho na</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVin,r D209a3; P306b5</td>
<td>don de <em>ni</em> but PVin,Skt 68,8</td>
<td>na ca sa evārthaḥ dKa’ gnas 474,19</td>
<td>don de <em>ṇid</em> bsDus don 11a3</td>
<td>don de <em>ṇid</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 Minor variations

A number of other variations do not count as significant variants: they consist of fluctuations of orthography and the alternative use of the abbreviated or full form of some expressions, for instance *rjes dpag/* *rjes su dpag pa*, *gnod bya/* *gnod par bya ba*, *bsgrub bya/* *bsgrub par bya ba*, etc. The variant *rtog pa/* *rtogs pa* is a borderline case. Indeed, in twelfth-century manuscripts the orthography for the Tibetan word that corresponds to *vikalpa* or *kalpanā* is also *rtogs pa*, whereas classical Tibetan distinguishes between *rtog pa* (equivalent to *vikalpa*,...
kalpanā, etc., negatively connoted as mistaken) and rtogs pa (pratipatti, adhigama, etc., positively connoted as a correct understanding).

2.2.3 Variants indicative of revisions

The overall correspondence of divisions of the source text, of the markers and other types of citations of the PVin in the various commentaries considered supports the hypothesis that their authors relied on the Tibetan translation prepared by rNog Lo (or on a version deriving from it) and followed to a large extent also rNog Lo’s analysis of the source text.

There is, however, a third category of variants that indicates that rNog Lo’s translation was modified over time and that these revisions, which remained isolated, occurred at an early stage. Below I list some cases that illustrate this process. Note that the line is often difficult to draw between intentional revision and corruption made by a scribe or even the author himself. Indeed we have no certitude that the authors concerned relied on a written version of the translation and consulted it whenever they cited the source text. If they did not proceed in such a way, the variants considered here can also be explained as the result of an inexact memory of the wording of the translation, to which the authors creatively palliated. In all the examples considered below, there is no reason to postulate that the variation is consecutive to access to a Sanskrit source containing a variant reading.

Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PVin_{skt} 9,5 (PVin 3.5) pakṣoktiḥ</th>
<th>PVin_{T} D190a2; P288a1</th>
<th>phyogs kyi tshig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dKa’ gnas 378,21; Ms A 93a2; Ms B</td>
<td>phyogs kyi nag</td>
<td>phyogs kyi tshig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(citation of PVin 3.4–5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(to be emended to phyogs kyi tshig for the sake of metrics)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The translation *phyogs kyi tshig* appears to be influenced by the translation of *pakṣavacana* as *phyogs kyi tshig* in the preceding sentences.

---

**PVinSkt 70,3 avadhatte**

*dKa’ gnas* 475,2; Ms A 115a2; Ms B 129a1

PVin₇ D209b3; P307a5

PVinT₇, D99b1; P117b5 (no Skt. lhur gñer ba available)

---

**PVinSkt 18,10 samudāyasya**

*dKa’ gnas* 481,2; Ms A 116a7; Ms B 130b5

’Od zer 157a6

PVin₇ D193a2; P291a2

PVinT₇, D25b4; P29b1 (PVinT₇, spyi 24a1 samudāyah)

In the sentence that precedes the translation *spyi* for *samudāya* (in this context, the combination of subject and property to be proven) is also attested in ’Od zer 156b8 and in PVinT₇, D25b2; P29a7 (PVinT₇, 23b5).

---

**PVinSkt 66,6 tattve**

*dKa’ gnas* 471,10; Ms A 113a4; Ms B de ŋid la 127b8

’Od zer 181a5

PVin₇ D208a7; P306a2

The translation *de ŋid la* appears to be inspired by Dharmottara’s interpretation of *tattve* as *padārthatavasya* (PVinT₇, Skt 90b4), translated *dnos po de ŋid la* (PVinT₇, D94b1; P112a1).
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---

**[5]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PVinSkt 82,7 (PVin 3.63) hetunā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>dKa’ gnas</em> 488,11; Ms A 118a4; Ms B 132b7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Od zer 187a2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVinT D213a4; P310b7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The choice of the ablative may have been influenced by the translation of the similar verse PV 1.7. This verse reads *hetunā samagrena* instead of *hetunā samarthena* but the Sanskrit instrumental is also translated with the ablative *rgyu tshogs pa las*.

In the preceding prose sentence *samarthena hetunā* is translated as *rgyu nus pa in the canon, but as *rgyu nus pa las* in 'Od zer 187a2 and in the citation of the words of the PVin in PVinṬ D113a7; P133a5 (PVinṬ Skt 104b8–105a1). |

---

**[6]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PVinSkt 73,5 sādhyatām</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>dKa’ gnas</em> 482,17; Ms A 116b6; Ms B 131a4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Od zer 184b5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bsDus pa 196b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVinT D210b1; P308a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVinṬ T D102b5; P121a6 (no Skt. available)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purely stylistic variation.

---

**[7]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PVinSkt 6,12 anyathābhhyupagamyā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Od zer</em> 150b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bsDus pa</em> 168a1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVinT D189a5; P287a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñ D232a5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variant of translation revealing a different understanding of the sentence.

I postulated at the beginning of §2 that rNog Lo was citing his own translation of the PVin in the *dKa’ gnas*. We may wonder, however,
whether he did not revise some of this translation while composing the *dKa’ gnas*. This is entirely possible. In view of the use of citations as a marker, one should in this case postulate that from this point onward the revised translation was circulating among his students. But did it fully replace a prior translation? Did rNog Lo revise his translation even after composing the *dKa’ gnas*? rNog Lo’s direct successors (whose works are not available to us) may have relied on the Kashmirian translation (either because it was the only one or because they chose to ignore the revisions) or on a revised translation that may be the one attested in the *dKa’ gnas*, or not. The question is even more complicated where later generations of commentators are concerned. Namely, we cannot establish which version of the translation they knew, but only which version of the translation they chose.

We can however draw some conclusions from the examples above. The readings of the citations of the PV in in the *dKa’ gnas* (with the exception of readings corrupted in the course of the transmission of the text), whether they are identical with the translation produced in Kashmir or a slightly modified version of the latter, are witnesses to rNog Lo’s first-generation translation. On the other hand, readings found in other early commentaries that postdate rNog Lo and in the canonical translation, unless confirmed by their occurrence in the *dKa’ gnas*, cannot be assumed to match the first-generation translation (even though they probably do in most cases). Revisions or involuntary modifications of the first-generation translation indeed took place in the course of the transmission of the PV. Examples [1] and [3] suggest revisions that took place before or in Phya pa’s time, examples [4], [5] and [6] suggest revisions postdating Phya pa. The nature and apparent reasons for these changes vary: they can be

---

23 Franco (1997: 287) notably interprets the variations between citations of verses of the PV in Sa skya Paṇḍita’s *Rigs gter* and in the translation preserved in the canon (for which Sa skya Paṇḍita is traditionally held responsible) by arguing that “while composing the Rigs gTer he was not only reading his own translation, but also consulting Dharmakīrti’s original again.”
be purely stylistic ([6]), terminological ([1], [2] and [3]) or reflect a different understanding of the sentence ([7]).

2.3. The translation of the PVinṬ

The PVin and the PVinṬ were translated by the same team, and their translation appears to have been carried out more or less simultaneously. The translation of the PVinṬ presupposes an established translation of the PVin. This can be observed in particular in the translation of passages of the PVinṬ in which Dharmottara cites words from the PVin as markers. In such cases, rNog Lo does not translate the cited words themselves, but presents the first words of the relevant section in the Tibetan translation of the PVin.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source text</th>
<th>PVinSkt 4,4</th>
<th>PVinT P286a5; D188a5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yas tu paraparikalpitaiḥ prasaṅgah</td>
<td>gzan gyis kun btags (P btags) pas thal ba bsgrub pa... gaṅ yin pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dharmottara’s commentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PVinSkt 5b7</th>
<th>PVinT_T P7b2; D6b1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yas tv iti...</td>
<td>gzan gyis žes smos so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, the translation of the PVin relies on an understanding of the text influenced by the PVinṬ, and its translation reflects the translation of the PVinṬ. A pertinent instance of this influence can be found when difficult terms of the PVin are rendered in the translation with a Tibetan word that actually corresponds to the translation of the synonym for the difficult term presented in the PVinṬ (see Part II for some examples).

This joint translation ensures a noticeable regularity in the respective Tibetan versions. Notably, words of the PVin quoted by

---

24 This line of inquiry could be extended by looking at other recently surfaced early commentaries on the PVin, such as the early-thirteenth-century commentary by Dar ma dkon mchog (cf. van der Kuijp 2003) and that by Chu mig pa (cf. n. 6 above).
Dharmottara (either as explicit or implicit quotations) and words embedded in his commentary are usually translated in the same way as they are in the translation of the PVin found in the canon (see, for example, the passage in §1 (1) PVinṬ, and examples [1] and [3] in §2.2.3).

Unfortunately, it is not possible to retrieve parts of the original translation of the PVinṬ in the way indicated for the PVin. Indeed, there are no early Tibetan commentaries on the PVinṬ itself, nor synaptic tables akin to Phya pa’s bsDus don on the PVin. rÑog Lo himself more frequently resorts to paraphrase than citation when referring to Dharmottara’s interpretation in the dKa’ gnas. This prevents us from clarifying what happened in the text transmission of the translation of the PVinṬ. It is likely that it underwent revisions and modifications as well. But, in the case of citation of the PVin in the PVinṬ, were these carried out simultaneously when the translation of the PVin was modified? This question remains in suspense for now: Cases where the canonical reading of the PVinṬ concords with the canonical reading of the PVin but differs from earlier readings of the PVin (such as [1] and [3]) could suggest a simultaneous revision. But an alternative scenario could be that the first-generation translations of the PVinṬ had for some reason a different translation than in the PVin, and that the revision of the PVin consisted in adopting the translation found in the PVinṬ. But there are also cases where the translation of the PVinṬ agrees with citations of the PVin in early commentaries but differs from the canonical translation of the PVin (for instance [6] and the remark in [5]). This would indicate that both translations were initially identical and only the PVin was revised.25

25 There remains the possibility that both were revised in different ways, with the result that the revised translation of the PVinṬ corresponds to the original translation of the PVin. But I find this scenario unlikely.
3. Summary and conclusion of Part I: Establishing a methodology for a pertinent comparison

Reviewing the available material in the first section of Part I has raised a troublesome methodological issue pertaining to the comparison of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions. Namely, we do not have at our disposal the “ideal comparands” consisting on the one hand of the Sanskrit version known to rNog Lo and on the other hand of the Tibetan translation as it was established by rNog Lo. As for the first, none of the extant manuscripts appear to be candidates for rNog Lo’s Sanskrit source. Further, we do not even know the nature of rNog Lo’s material — he might have had access to several manuscripts and/or oral versions — or which degree of editorial work he might have exercised in order to establish the Sanskrit version that was the source of his translation. As for the second, the available versions of the Tibetan translation are the result of a complex process of transmission that reveals the intrusion of scribal mistakes, but also of early punctual revisions. In the second section of Part I I have discussed the possibility of retrieving some of the lost original translation by relying on citations of words of the PVin in rNog Lo’s dKa’ gnas. This possibility exists but gives us access to a very limited portion of the text, and often to parts of the text that are not crucial to its understanding (e.g., beginnings of sentences such as “therefore,” “in this regard,” etc).

This preliminary investigation directs the adoption of the following policy of comparison for the case studies to be carried out in Part II26: for the Tibetan version, I will consider the reading of the canonical translation preserved in the Peking and sDe dge bsTan ’gyur. While doing so, one must keep in mind that, unless this reading is confirmed by a citation in the dKa’ gnas, it might not exactly match rNog Lo’s original translation. The conclusions pertaining to

---

26 In Part II I take up selected cases from the third chapter of the PVin where one can detect a difference between the comparands the origin of which dates to the moment of the translation of the text rather than to the hazards of transmission. In this connexion, see also Sakai (2010: viii–xii), which deals with some examples from rNog Lo’s translation of PVinṬ 2.
the translation that I will ascribe to rNyog Lo might therefore have to be attributed instead to a later revisor. This Tibetan version will be compared to the Sanskrit readings of the available manuscripts but without assuming a priori that these readings were the ones adopted by rNyog Lo as his source. Further, I take into account the potential editorial input of the translator by considering that “adoption as a source” can consist either in adopting as a source a reading extant in the material available to him or in adopting as a source an emended reading. This gives us the following options:

(1) A Sanskrit reading attested among our manuscripts was the one adopted by rNyog Lo as his source. This can be (1a) because he had access to a manuscript or oral version with this very reading or (1b) because he did not think any of the sources available to him were correct and adopted an emended version that turns out to match the reading of one or more of the extant manuscripts.

(2) rNyog Lo adopted as his source another Sanskrit reading than the ones in the extant manuscripts. This can be (2a) because he had access to a different manuscript reading or knew this variant from an oral version or (2b) because he did not think any of the sources available to him were correct and adopted an emended reading that turns out not to match any of the extant manuscripts.

Whenever a difference between the Sanskrit and the Tibetan comparands is examined, I will speak of the choice of translation as being “source-related” when option (2) applies because it relies on the existence or construction of an alternative source version as the basis of translation. When option (1) applies, I will speak by contrast of the difference as being “translator-” or “translation-related,” as it does not presuppose a different source text, but is only a matter of how the translator decided to render the given term in the target language.

To give a fictional example, if one finds the Tibetan expression śīṅ in a translation whereas the extant Sanskrit manuscripts read śīṃśapā, it is a source-related difference if the translator was not
actually translating the word śīṃśapā, but intended to translate the word taru; however, it is a translator-related difference if he was actually proposing that śīṅ should translate śīṃśapā in this context.

As can be foreseen, it will be difficult, and often impossible, to conclusively decide which of the two options applies in each case. My goal here will not be to offer a final explanation. Rather, I would like to highlight the often neglected role of the translator by showing that most cases for which the unexpected or diverging Tibetan version would, at first sight, appear to be source-related can be interpreted instead as translator-related insofar as a cogent explanation can be given for the choice of translation, even when this choice involves features such as the addition of words.

Part II — Translation style and techniques: case studies

It is obvious that the same text in a source language can give rise to a variety of translations in a target language, even when these translations aim at staying as literal as possible. Regarding the PVin, it suffices to compare rNog Lo and Parahitabhadra’s translation with the portions cited in Jñānaśrībhadra’s commentary, which was translated by Jñānaśrībhadra himself and Khyun po Chos kyi brtson ’grus, to realize the latitude involved in the translator’s choice. At what point can one say that the Tibetan “differs” from the Sanskrit? I examine below various phenomena that can be included under the heading of “difference.” In the first section I consider the specific rendering of terms or expressions where the Tibetan can be described as “unexpected.” That is, for instance, when the translator himself adopted another Tibetan translation for other occurrences of the same Sanskrit expression in the same text, when another translation for this expression is more frequent in other texts or when the pair of

27 Regarding Buddhist philosophical texts Seyfort Ruegg discusses the case of two different Tibetan versions of the same Sanskrit text, the Prajñā- pāramitāsūtra, in his 1992: 383–384. He points out differences that are stylistic, terminological, and differences involving interpretation (“religio-philosophical variations”). Other examples of multiple translations are mentioned on pp. 384–385.
comparands is not known to be attested in other texts at all, including cases where the Tibetan does not carry the same meaning as the Sanskrit term. I also consider in this context the alternative between a calque translation (which mirrors the Sanskrit expression) and a translation that favors meaning.

In section 2 I take up cases where the difference pertains to the syntax of a sentence. While a difference in syntax is expectable between two different languages, one can still point out cases where the syntax of the Tibetan does not reflect the structure of the Sanskrit sentence as well as cases where links between subsentences are made explicit in the Tibetan.

The third type of difference that I will examine (section 3) is the case where the Tibetan version contains one or more words that have no equivalent in the Sanskrit version.

Lastly (section 4), I address two cases where the Tibetan version lacks an expression present in the Sanskrit version.

In the passages cited below, the reading of the Tibetan passage in D and P is given without emendations. Words in italics are words from the PVin cited or re-used in commentaries, while expressions under discussion appear in bold print. For PVinTSkt I offer the diplomatic reading of the manuscript when it is available. {} contain words deleted in the manuscript, <> words added in the manuscript, () indicate unclear characters. My emendations are given in square brackets.

1. The rendering of terms and expressions

Various options often present themselves to a translator when translating isolated terms or expressions, insofar as the target language may offer a range of synonyms. For example, in one passage rNog Lo and Parahitabhadra translate the word pradīpaḥ (“lamp”) as sgron ma (PVinT D217b5; P315b4), while Jñānaśrī and Khyuṅ po translate it as mar me (Jñ D274b4). Both qualify as “expect-

28 See also Part I, §2.2.3 for cases of terms of which the translation was changed in the course of the transmission of the translation of the PVin.
able” translations. Apart from synonyms another alternative that translators have, especially for complex expressions, compounds or derivatives, is to adopt a calque translation or to adopt a translation that conveys the same meaning but does not reflect the composition of the source expression. When opting for a translation in which the meaning rules over the structure, the translator’s choice may follow an established usage. But there are also cases where the attested translation is unexpected. In some cases the chosen Tibetan term approximates the meaning of the Sanskrit term; in other cases it conveys a different meaning. When dealing with such cases, I will debate whether a source-based explanation or a translator-based explanation can best explain the Tibetan reading.

[1] āveśa — ’brel pa

rNog Lo translates the expression avasthāntarāvesāt as gnas skabs gz’an dañ ’brel pa’i phyir. The expression āveśa (“joining,” “taking possession of”) is rare in Dharmakīrti’s writing. It occurs only one other time in PVSV 165,12 ad 1.312–313, where it is rendered by goms pa (“being familiar with”).

In the PVinṬ, Dharmottara uses the expression avasthāntareṇa samsargād “due to combination/union with another condition (avasthā),” translated as gnas skabs gz’an dañ ’brel pa’i phyir.

One can think here of both a source-related explanation and a translator-related explanation. The former would be that both Dharmottara and rNog Lo had adopted avasthāntarasamsargāt as their source text. The latter (more likely in my opinion) would be that they both had adopted the reading avasthāntarāvesāt. Dharmottara

29 The Mahāvyutpatti prescribes mar me for dīpāḥ (6117), and sgron ma to translate pradīpāḥ in various compounds.
30 PVSV Skt 165,11–13: teṣām aviditārthaniyamānāṁ atyakṣāveśād avidvān eva dosapaplavah kaścit tatvam vyācaṣte nāpara iti na nyāyyam. PVSV T D358b4–5; P525b5–6: lkg tu gyur pa goms, pa’i phyir ņes pas bslad (P slad) ciṅ mi mkhas pa ’ga’ źig don ņes pa rigs pa med pa can de dag de kho na ņid du ’chad par byed pa, yin la | gz’an ni ma yin no ņes bya bar rigs pa ma yin no ||
Pascale Hugon

glossed āveśāt with samsargāt. As for rNog Lo, in the absence of a fixed translation for āveśa, he attempted to render the meaning of the whole expression by an approximating Tibetan term. The choice of term here could be directed by Dharmottara’s explanation or alternatively influenced by the translation of the related term samāveśa as 'brel pa in an earlier passage (PVinSkt 48,6–7).

| PVinSkt 94,4 | vastv ekam evāvasthāntaraśeśād bhedadrṣṭir iti cet  |
| PVinD216a7–b1; P314a5 | dṇos po gcig ńid gnas skabs gźan dañ ’brel pa’i phyir | tha dad par mṅon par yin no źe na  |
| “Objection: One conceives the distinction (between avasthā and avasthātā) because a unique entity can enter/be joined with another condition (avasthā).” |
| PVinSkt 115a1 | avasthāntareṇa samsarggād bhedadrṣṭir bha-vati  |
| PVinT D126b2; P148a7 | gnas skabs gźan dañ ’brel pa’i phyir tha dad par mṅon pa yin  |

| PVinSkt 48,6–7 | na hi sa eva brāhmaṇas tajjātiyogād abrāhma-naś ca dharmāntarasamāvesāl  |
| PVinT D203a6–7; P300b8 | de’i rigs dañ ldan pa’i phyir de ńid bram ze yin la | chos gźan dañ ’brel pa’i phyir de ńid bram ze ma yin pa yah yin par ni ’jig rten na rtogs pa med do  |
| “Indeed, it is not recognized in the world that the very same person would be both a Brahmin because he is linked (yoga) with the universal of this [i.e., of Brahmin-hood] and not a Brahmin because he is endowed by/joined with (samāveṣa) another property [i.e., a property other than being a Brahmin].” |
| PVinSkt 70b4 | abrāhmaṇaś ca brāhmaṇyād dharmāntaraṇa samāvesāt0  |
| PVinT D74b2; P87b8 | bram ze las chos gźan pa dañ ’brel ba’i phyir bram ze ma yin pa yah yin no Žes... |
| Jñ D253b6 | chos gźan dañ ldan pa ni ser skya’am mañ du za ba’am | riṅ ba ńid dañ Žo  |
vicāra — tha sñad

The Tibetan translation of the PVin usually uses the term dpyod pa for the Sanskrit vicāra (“analysis, investigation”). On a single occasion, one finds instead the term tha sñad (“convention”), which usually translates vyavahāra. This version of PVin_Tib is attested in Chu mig pa’s commentary. Did rNog Lo adopt vyavahāra as his Sanskrit source? Or if he adopted vicāra, why did he choose the translation tha sñad? The notion of “convention” or “conventional practice” does not occur in this discussion of the PVin, which concerns the nature of the subject in a philosophical discussion, i.e., the context where one undertakes an investigation (vicāraprastāva). Let us consider Dharmottara’s commentary:

Dharmottara introduces Dharmakīrti’s sentence by a hypothetical objection, which asks why a certain type of subject would not be something to be investigated (avicāryam — rnam par dpyad par bya ba ma yin). Dharmakīrti’s sentence is the answer to this question. Dharmottara reformulates this sentence, embedding some words from the PVin and glossing others. His explanation is that a subject that is not established for both debaters does not support “a convention/conventional practice (vyavahāra) characterized by the acceptance of contradictory properties.” To illustrate this idea, Dharmottara gives as an example of what he terms a “convention/conventional practice based on a distinction” (bhedāśrayo vyavahāraḥ — khyad par gyi rten can gyi tha sñad du ’gyur ba) the question of whether a given object is permanent or impermanent. It is clear that “convention/conventional practice based on a distinction” represents Dharmottara’s understanding of the expression “investigation based on a distinction” (viśeṣāśrayaṃ vicāram) in the PVin.

Thus a translator-based explanation can be offered for the translation tha sñad by invoking the influence of the commentary: Dharmottara’s gloss was adopted to render Dharmakīrti’s original expression.

Note that Jñānaśrī proceeds to the same reformulation, as he rephrases dpyod pāi gzi rbyed pa med as gzi tha sñad rbyed pa ni med de.
PVin\textsubscript{Skt} 24,10–11
na hi tathoparacito \textquote{prasiddharūpasāmānyo viśe-
śārayaṃ vicāram āśrayate}

PVin\textsubscript{Tib} D194b7–195a1; P292b7
de ltar rab tu bkod pa'i no bo mtshuṅs par ma
grub can dag ni khyad par gyi rten can (P add
yin) gyi tha sñad kyi (D om. kyi) rten ma yin pa'i
phyir ro \parallel

\textquote{Indeed, what is thus \{mentally\} constructed, whose common nature is not
established, does not support investigation/convention which has for its
basis a particularity \{i.e., a property\}.}"

PVin\textsubscript{Ṭ} Skt 32b2–4
nanu ya(ṣe)d evārthakāri ta(ya)d eva siddhānte
[em. siddāntena] viśiṣṭaṃ kalpitam
tat katham avicā{dha}ryam ity āha | na hī
yasmāt tathā hi svecchayā upacarito yo dharmy
aprasiddhmanubhavena rūpasāmānyamubhayor
vvādipravādinor yasya viśeṣa āśrayo yasya vya-
vahārasya viruddhadharmābhyyupagamalakṣaṇa-
sya tan nāśrayate |

PVin\textsubscript{T} T D34b7–35a1
gal te don byed pa gaṅ yin pa de ſnid khyad par
can du grub pa'i mtha' brtags pa ma yin nam |
de ci ltar mam par dpayad par bya ba ma yin Že
na | de ltar Žes smos so \parallel
gaṅ gi phyir chos can gaṅ Žig raṅ gi 'dod pas ſe
bar bkod pa'i rgol ba daṅ phyir rgol ba gni ga la
ño bo mtshuṅs par ſams su moṅ bar ma grub pa
gaṅ yod pa ni khyad par gyi rten gaṅ la yod pa'i
tha sñad 'gal ba'i chos khas len pa'i mtshan ſnid
can de'i rten ma yin pa'i phyir ro \parallel

Jñ D242a5–7
gal te raṅ gi mtshan ſnid ma yin pa dag kyaṅ dgag
pa'i phyir | dpayad par byed pa ma yin nam Že na |
de ſzin du Žes bya ba smos te | raṅ gi mtshan ſnid
gni ga la grub pa'i gzi med pa de ſzin du'o || rgol
ba daṅ phyir rgol la spyir grub pa'o || 'di'i raṅ ſzin
ji lta bu Žes dpayad pa'i gzi̯ byed pa med de | gzi̯
ma grub pa'i phyir ro || de'i phyir gzi̯ tha sñad
byed pa ni med de | spyir mthun pa'i tha sñad bya
bar mi nus pa'i phyir ro \parallel
de lta bas na brtags pa dag dgag par bya ba bar ni
rīgs kyi rtags kyi gzi̯ bya ba ni ma yin no \parallel raṅ
ſnid kyi sgras ni rtags kyi yul ston pa'i phyir ro \parallel
The translation of terms that occur in verses is often conditioned by the metric. However, the Tibetan language can make use of a variety of devices, notably to make up for missing syllables (the addition of a meaningless ni being a frequent one). In the case of the translation med na mi 'byuñ for sambaddha, the choice of translation goes beyond mere metrical concerns. The two terms are related in meaning but med na mi 'byuñ is more specific: sambaddha expresses the idea of something related (it is usually translated as 'brel pa); med na mi 'byuñ, which literally means “non-occurrence in the absence of,” usually translates anantarīyakata or avinābhāva, which is a type of relation where one relatum is a necessary condition for the other. A common English translation is “invariably related.”

The Tibetan version of verse PVin 3.13 in the canon is identical to the Tibetan version of PV 4.52. While the Sanskrit manuscripts of the PVin all have the reading sambaddhasyaiva bādhanaṁ, the Sanskrit verse of the PV in the manuscript of the PV used by Saṅkṛtyāyana and in the verses integrated in Manorathanandin’s commentary reads nāntarīyakabādhanaṁ. But the PVA gives the verse in the form sambaddhasyaiva bādhanaṁ, also translated with med na mi 'byuñ in the canonical Tibetan version of the PVA. Sambaddhasyaiva bādhanaṁ also appears in Prajñākaragupta’s gloss on this verse but is this time translated as 'brel pa ŋid kyis.

It would appear that there were two variant versions of the Sanskrit verse in circulation but one unique Tibetan translation.

Dharmottara gives no evidence of having known a version with nāntarīyaka and does not use this notion in his commentary, where he merely rephrase sambaddha (“connected”) as sambandhī dharmah (“the property that has a connection”). But in the Tibetan trans-
lation *sambaddhāsya* is translated as *brel pa'i chos*, while *sambandhī dharmaḥ* is rendered with *med na mi* *byuṅ ba'i chos*.

The Tibetan version of Jñānaśrībhadra's commentary also introduces the notion of “not arising without” when glossing the expression *brel ba* (indicative of the Sanskrit reading *sambaddha*).

In the case of the PVinṬ, it is clearly the translator who introduces the notion of an “invariable connection,” which found its way also into the translation of the verse PVin 3.13. This choice of translation may be related to the translator’s knowledge of the alternative version of PV 4.52, or he might be re-using the translation of this verse. But it may also simply be a matter of expressing in the translation the interpretation of the type of “connection” intended by Dharmakīrti.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVinSkt 3.13ab (21,10)</td>
<td>tatrāpi sādhyadharmsya <em>sambaddhāsya</em>iva bā-dhanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVinTib D193b7; P291b7</td>
<td>der (P de) yaṅ bsgrub bya'i chos dañ ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In this case, too, [when one adopts a treatise] the invalidation of what is precisely <em>linked/invariably related</em> with the property to be proven is to be avoided.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVinT_Skt 28a5–6</td>
<td>tatrapi [em.: tatrāpi] śāstraparigrahe sādhyadharmsya yaḥ sambandhī dharmmaḥ kṣaṇikutvasya nairātmyaṃ sambaddhān tasyaiva <em>sambaddhāsya</em> yaḥ bādhakaṃ tat pariḥartavayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVinT_T D30a7</td>
<td>bstan bcos yoṅs su len pa <em>der yaṅ</em> dper na skad cik ma ſid dañ dañ bdag med pa <em>brel pa ltar</em> bsgrub bya'i chos dañ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñ D204b1</td>
<td>luṅ gis brtsad pa <em>de la yaṅ bsgrub bya'i chos kyis ni</em> <em>brel bar</em> <em>gyur ba</em> ste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV_Skt 4.52</td>
<td>tatrāpi sādhyadharmsya nāntariyakabādhanam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The occurrence of the Tibetan gsal ba (“instance”) where our Sanskrit manuscripts unanimously read dravya (“substance”) — a Tibetan version known to Phya pa and Chu mig pa — strongly suggests a source-based explanation. Indeed, the expected Tibetan translation of dravya is rdzas, whereas gsal ba suggests in this context the Sanskrit vyakti. A citation of this passage in Prajñākaragupta’s commentary suggests a Sanskrit variant with vyakti, but if I understand Samkṛtyāyana’s editorial conventions correctly, this reading is the editor’s own emendation of the text for which he does not give any support. This emendation is not supported by the Tibetan translation of the PVA, which contains neither gsal ba nor rdzas. Other texts that cite this passage also lack the term vyakti or dravya. A translator-based explanation is also possible by invoking the influence of the commentary: Dharmottara seems to have known the reading dravya (the manuscript is particularly hard to decipher here and the reading dravya can at best be conjectured); the Tibetan translation reads rdzas, as expected. But in the course of the explanation of the long compound in which the term occurs the Tibetan translation reads gsal ba dañ 'brel ba'i rañ bžin. The Sanskrit here is illegible, leaving two options open: the PVinṬ reads vyakti, and Dharmottara’s gloss of dravya as vyakti has influenced the translation in the PVin, or the PVinṬ reads dravya, and the translator adopts the term gsal.

33 See the edition of the PVin 3, p. 4, under f.
ba to express, like in the PVin\textsubscript{T}, a specific understanding of the term in this context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVin\textsubscript{Skt} 4,4–5</td>
<td>deśakālāvasthāviśeṣaniyataikadravyasamsargāvyavacchinassvabhāvāntaravirahād</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PVin\textsubscript{T} D188a5–6; P286a5–6 | yul dañ dus dañ gnas skabs kyi khyad par Ńes pa'ī gsal ba geig dañ 'dres pas rnam par ma bead pa rañ bžin gźan gyis stoṅ pa'ī phyir te |}

“...because, it is devoid of the other essential property [i.e., multiplicity], which is not characterized by being mixed with a specific instance determined in view of its specificity of place, time and condition.” [transl. following Dharmottara's understanding]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVin\textsubscript{T Skt} 6a4–6</td>
<td>[mostly illegible]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PVin\textsubscript{T T} D6b7–7a2 | yul dañ dus dañ gnas skabs de dag ŋid gźan las khyad par du gyur pas khyad par te | de dag tu Ńes pa'ī rdzas geig dañ lhan cig tu spyi 'dres pa ste | rdzas yul la sogs par Ńes pa'ī phyir 'dres pa yaṅ Ńes pa yin no | 'dres pa des rnam par ma bead cin khyad par du ma byas pa'ī rañ bžin gźan gaṅ yin pa de stuṅ pa ste dben pa 'am | yaṅ na de stuṅ žin med pa ste de'ī phyir ro |]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVA\textsubscript{Skt} 476,1–2</td>
<td>deśakālāvasthāviśeṣaniyataika(vyakti)-samsarga(sic)vyavacchinassvabhāvāntaravirahād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVA\textsubscript{T} D131a4</td>
<td>yul dañ dus dañ gnas skabs kyi khyad par Ńes pa geig dañ 'dres pas rnam par ma bead pa'ī rañ bžin gźan gyis stoṅ pa'ī phyir žes bya ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Od zer 149a7</td>
<td>bsgrub bya ni yul lasogs pa'ī khyad par can gyi gsal ba gźan dañ Idan pa ma yin te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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[5] sañcāra — byugs(byug) pa

In a discussion in the context of non-apprehension (anupalabdhi), Dharmakīrti explains that judgments of absence are based on a positive experience, the apprehension of something else. Answering an objection, he explains that this “apprehension” is not necessarily visual; it can also take the form of a feeling when someone determines the absence of a pot in a dark room: this person has the specific feeling of the internal contact of her own hands. The situation is described in the objection by the phrase yathā santa-mase hastasañcārena. The term sañcāra is translated as byugs (D byug) pa; in the following sentence again, de ltar byugs pa'i renders tathāsañcārinah. The same Tibetan term is also used in the PV and in Jñānaśrībhadra’s citation of this passage of the PV.

According to the Mahāvyutpatti (6114), the verb byug should be used to translate upalepana (“smearing, anointing”). Sañcāra conveys instead the idea of “walking through.” For sañcārya, the Mahāvyutpatti prescribes the verbs skyod (“to stir, agitate”) and spo ba (“to change place”). One finds this second option in the translation of several verses of the PV.34

A source-based explanation would be that both Jñānaśrībhadra and rNog Lo adopted a variant reading for the Sanskrit that had the meaning of “anointing” (maybe arrived at via a graphic confusion with a form of the verb aini?). Another possibility is that they understood sañcāra in the sense of the causative form of the verb, as meaning “to cause to come together, bring into contact” — in other

34 See PV 3.514 na syāt sañcāro viṣayāntare — yul gzan la ni ’pho mi ’gyur; PV 3.519 sañcārakaṇaṇābhāvād — ’pho ba’i rgyu ni med pāi phyir; PV 3.520 viṣayāntarasañcāro — yul gzan la ni ’pho ’gyur na; PV 3.539 viṣayāntarasañcāre — gal te yul gzan ’pho ba na.
words, to clap or rub hands. In such a case, the adoption of *byug pa* as a translation could be explained as an interpretative translation that associates the idea of rubbing hands with the application of an unguent. I keep the option open that the verb also has a meaning akin to *sañcāra* which is not listed in usual dictionaries. Unfortunately, Indian and Tibetan commentators do not explain this example further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PV in <em>Skt</em> 60,11–61,1</td>
<td><em>yathā santamase hastasañcāreṇa</em></td>
<td>like by <em>fumbling (with)/rubbing</em> hands in the darkness [there arises the thought “there is no pot, etc.” even though one does not see something void of a pot].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV in <em>T</em> D206b6; P304b1</td>
<td>dper na mun khuṇ du lag pa <em>byugs</em> (D <em>byug</em>) pa <em>bzin</em> no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV in <em>T</em> 86a2–3</td>
<td>*yathā santamase santate tamasi hastasaṃcāreṇaḥ abhāvapraṭītir ghaṭādīnāṃ [...] saṃcarato hastasyāntara ātmīyo viśiṣṭaḥ</td>
<td>sparśa upalabhyate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV in <em>T</em> D89b5–6</td>
<td>dper na mun khuṇ mun pa‘i smag tu lag pa <em>byugs pas</em> bum pa la sogs pa med par rtogs pa yod pa <em>bzin</em> no <em>že</em> na [...] <em>byugs pa’i</em> lag pa‘i naṇ gi bdag niid kyi khyad par can gyi reg pa dmigs pas <em>yin</em> no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñ D257b4</td>
<td><em>mun par lag pas</em> <em>byug pa na</em> <em>že</em> bya ba ni mun pa‘i sa phygos na bum pas stoṅ pa myoṅ ba med de mi mthoṅ ba‘i phyir ro sñam du sms pa’o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[6] *niyataprāptiḥ* — *gdon mi za bar ’gyur ba*

The calque translation for the Sanskrit expression *niyataprāptiḥ* (here a *bahuvrīhi* meaning lit. “whose obtaining is definite”) would be the Tibetan expression *ñes par ’thob pa*. This expression is found in the Tibetan translation of Jñānaśrībhadra’s commentary. rÑog Lo instead uses the expression *gdon mi za bar ’gyur ba* (lit. “becoming without doubt”) for *niyataprāptiḥ* in the PVin and *de gdon mi za bar*
'gyur for nīyatā prāptir asya in the PVinT. This rendering does not necessitate postulating a distinct source text:

The rendering of prāptih as 'gyur is justified because in this context the term does not have the literal meaning of obtaining something but expresses a consequence that is arrived at if something is accepted. The translation of prāptih as thob pa or 'gyur ba is discussed by Franco in his studies of the various translations of the Pramāṇavārttika (Franco 2007): in verse PV 2.47, the older translation attested in Devendrabuddhi’s commentary renders prāpti with thob (in the expression grahaṇaprāptera), and this translation was later revised as ‘gyur.

The rendering of nīyata as gdon mi za bar is attested in the Mahāvyutpatti and is an acceptable alternative to ās par as far as meaning is concerned. But one can note that elsewhere in PVin 3 rNog Lo consistently uses ās pa whenever the expression nīyata occurs in Sanskrit, whereas the Tibetan gdon mi za bar translates avaśyam (twice in P286b5, P294b7, etc.) and once asandigdho (P314a5). Similarly, elsewhere in the PVinT gdon mi za bar is used mainly to translate avaśyam. It is exceptionally used twice in PVinT (D70b3 and D70b5) for nīyamena (PVinT, 67a2), an expression for which he uses ās pa/ās par elsewhere in the commentary.

We may suggest that a reason for rNog Lo’s choice of gdon mi za bar over ās par is a consequence of his choice of ‘gyur to render prāpti. Indeed, the translation ās par ‘gyur would have been ambiguous, as it could be understood either in the sense of “certainly takes place” (which is what the Sanskrit intends) or in the sense of “becomes determined,” which might trigger other associations in a philosophical text.
The expected translation for the Sanskrit term aṅga (lit. “member”) is the Tibetan yan lag. A calque translation of the expression aṅgāṅgitā would have been *yan lag daṅ yan lag can (ṇid). Instead, rNog Lo renders the expression with the Tibetan rtags daṅ rtags can. This is a calque translation of the Sanskrit liṅga-liṅginoḥ (“the logical reason and what has the logical reason”), attested to translate the latter in an earlier portion of PVin 3. The choice of a different translation appears here to have been influenced by the translation of aṅgāṅgitā as rtags daṅ rtags can yin pa in the verse that directly follows (PVin 3.79). In turn, it is likely that the translation of the verse draws from the translation of the almost identical verse PV 4.186, in which aṅgāṅgitā is translated as rtags daṅ rtags can. In both cases, the choice of translation may have been guided by metrical reasons.35 It reflects accurately the intention of the text, since the “member” under consideration is the logical reason (liṅga). Jñānaśrī explicates the equivalence in his commentary.

35 See also the translation of PVin 3.27cd (=PV 4.92), which also uses rtags for aṅgam (translation attested in ‘Od zer 166b7). The prose commentary (29,10) glosses käryāṅgam with käryalakṣaṇam liṅgam, also translated (as expected in this case) as ‘bras bu’i mtshan ṅid can gyi rtags (D196b2–3; P294b2).
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---

The Tibetan in D and P omits translating śāmāṇyaṃ. Jñ D278a1 cites the PV in the form gtan tshigs spyi'i chos.

---

As in the two previous cases, the translation ŉes pa ŋid du yoṁs su 'dzin pa (adopted by Phya pa) is not a calque of the Sanskrit ekānta-parigrahe. While conveying the same meaning, ŉes pa ŋid du (“in a determined way”) does not reflect the structure of the Sanskrit compound ekānta (eka-anta, lit. “one-ended”) like the calque mtha’ gcig does.

The rendering of ekānta by ŉes pa alone is frequent in Tibetan. It is illustrated, for instance, in the technical expression for inconclusive
logical reasons (anaikāntika — ma ņes pa). Besides, ņes pa also translates niyata and niyama (cf. [6]). Elsewhere in PVin and PVinṬ rNog Lo adopts the translations gcig tu ņes pa(r) for ekānta. This expression is a partial calque that conveys the meaning “certain/determined” while preserving the lexical equivalent of “eka” with “gcig tu.”

The rendering ņes pa ņid du is thus justified in view of the meaning of the text, as confirmed by Dharmottara’s commentary which glosses ekāntaḥ with niyataḥ.

Interestingly, in the translation of the PVinṬ one finds the Tibetan term mtha’ gcig as a gloss of the expression ņes pa ņid du cited from the PVin rather than the other way around. The same can be observed in a subsequent passage: ekānta° in the expression ekāntasādhanatvam in PVin is rendered as ņes par (translation already attested in the ’Od zer); in the PVinṬ, where this compound is explained as ekānte sādhanatvam and ekānta glossed with niścaya,

---

36 For instance, when citing a passage by Dignāga containing the expression ekāntavyāvṛtteḥ (PVinŚkt 46,3). This expression is translated gcig tu ņes par (D pa) ldog pa’i phyir rn (PVinT D202b2; P300a2). This translation is adopted in ’Od zer 175b2. Dharmakīrti explains the expression ekāntavyāvṛtyā (Tib. gcig tu ņes pa ldog pas). In his commentary, Dharmottara explains ekānta as niścaya (PVinŚkt 66b7 ekāntaniścayasya vyāvṛter abhāvāḥ ca). The Tibetan keeps to the translation gcig tu ņes pa for ekānta and adopts gdon mi za bar for niścaya. See also PVinŚkt 59,10: na cet, na kadācit kasyacīt kiṃcid ity ekānta esah, translated as ... ’i ni gcig tu ņes pa yin no (this translation is also adopted in PVinṬ).

37 Dharmottara states the equivalence of ekānta and niścaya on other occasions. See, for instance, a subsequent passage of the PVinṬ where the expression ekāntaparigraha appears again: yadi siddhe hetāv ekāntaparigraho niścayākhyo nānyathā (PVinŚkt 10a1). This is translated: gal te ḡtan tshigs grub na ņes par mtha’ gcig tu ’dzin par ’gyur gyi gzan du ni ma yin pas | (PVinT T D10b). On one occasion, the Tibetan does not translate the equivalence made between the two expressions by Dharmottara: PVinŚkt 67b6, commenting on the expression ekāntenānakāntikaḥ, says ekāntena niścayanena. Instead of translating this, the Tibetan states ņes pa kho na ma ņes pa ņid ni ma yin no || (PVinT T D71b2).
the translation bears ṇes par for the word cited from the PVin and mtṣa' gcig tu for the gloss.\(^{38}\)

In both cases, a purely translator-related explanation can be offered to account for both the translations of the PVin and the PVinṬ along the following scenario: the translator first chose to translate ekānta\(^{\circ}\) as ṇes pa ṇid du/ṇes par in the PVin, possibly under the influence of Dharmottara's commentary glossing ekānta\(^{\circ}\) with niyata/niścaya. Turning to translate the PVinṬ, he had to retain ṇes pa ṇid du/ṇes par to translate the expression cited from the PVin for coherence's sake. This generates a difficulty in translating Dharmottara's gloss because it would be tautological to have ṇes pa ṇid du/ṇes par glossed with ṇes pa ṇid du/ṇes par. r.chomp Lo thus renders the gloss niyata/niścaya by resorting to the calque rendering of ekānta, the Tibetan mtṣa' gcig, even though this expression is not usually attested as a translation of niyata or niścaya.\(^{39}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PVin(_{\text{Skt}}) 5,8</th>
<th>ekāntaparigrahe syād eṣa doṣah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVin(_{T}) D188b4; P286b4-5</td>
<td>ṇes pa ṇid du yoṇs su 'dzin pa skyon 'dir 'gyur ba 'am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"In the case that they would be taken as established [by the proponent], there would be this fault (due to his beliefs being different)."

'Od zer 150a2

PVin\(_{\text{T}}\)\(_{\text{Skt}}\) 9b1

PVin\(_{\text{T}}\)\(_{T}\) D9b3

\(\text{PVi}_n\)\(_{T}\)\(_T\) D9b3

\(\text{PVi}_n\)\(_T\)\(_T\) D9b3

38 Jñānaśrībhadra has a different interpretation of the compound. He translates ekānta as gcig and glosses it as "perception."

39 There are other examples of the same phenomenon. For instance r.chomp Lo translates the term viraha in the long compound deśakālāvasthāviṃśeṣaniyataikadrayasamsargāvyavacchinnasvabhāvāntaravirahāḥ (PVin\(_{\text{Skt}}\) 4,4–5) as stōṇ pa (PVin\(_{T}\) D188a5–6, P286a5–6). When it comes to translate Dharmottara's gloss of virahaḥ as śūnyatvaṃ (PVin\(_{T}\)\(_T\) 6a5), r.chomp Lo retains stōṇ pa for the former expression and uses dben pa for the latter (PVin\(_{T}\)\(_T\) D7a1).
Jñ D231a2–3 | gcig tu ñes par gcig du ma la ’jug pa ñid du yoṅs su bzuṅ nas rtags ma grub pa’i skyon ’dir ’gyur gyi

PVin-Skt 36,11–37,1 | na ca pramāṇalakṣaṇavyatirikto ’nyo ’sti viśeṣaḥ pratyakṣasya | ya ekāntasādhanatvaḥ (vari-ant: ekāntam sādhanam) vyavasthāpayati |

PVin₁ D199a5–6; P297a3–4 | gaṅ źig ñes par sgrub par byed par ’jog pa tshad ma’i mtshan ñid las tha dad pa’i khyad par ni yod pa ma yin te |

“And there is no characteristic for perception apart from the definition of valid cognition that would posit it to be an exclusive means of establishment.”

’Od zer 172b7 | khyad par gżan mi ruṅ ba ni gaṅ źig ñes par źes pa ste

PVinTₕ Skt 53b6 | sa ekānte niścaya [em. niścayaṃ] sādhanatvaṃ na vyavasthāpayati |

PVinT₉ D56b4 | de ni źes par źes bya ba mtha’ gcig tu sgrub par byed pa ñid rnam par ’jog pa ma yin no "

Jñ D248a2–3 | gal te bye brag yod na ni bye brag des gcig ste mṅon sum grub par byed pa źes bya bar tshad mar rnam par gžag la |

[9] syāt — grub par ’gyur ba

For the Sanskrit syāt ("would be the case"), one finds in one passage the Tibetan grub par ’gyur ba ("would be established"), which suggests the Sanskrit *sidhyati or *siddham syāt.

Dharmottara uses sidhyati (Tib. ’grub par ’gyur ro) in his commentary; Jñānaśrī’s commentary uses the verb bsgrub pa but in neither case are these given as explicit citations of the source text.

This may invoke a source-based explanation, namely the adoption of the Sanskrit reading sidhyati, known also to Dharmottara and Jñānaśrībhadra. But a translator-based explanation may also be proposed, namely that the Tibetan of the PVin makes explicit the interpretation of the sentence proposed by Dharmottara.
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PVinSkt 13,9–10

PVinT D191a5; P289a6
tato bāhyenārthenārthavattvam aniṣṭaṃ syāt |
dei phiy phiy rol gyi don dañ ldan pa ŋid mi ’dod pa grub par ’gyur ba’am |

“Therefore, the fact of having a meaning by means of an external object [and not by its own nature only], which is unintended [by the Avyutpattivādin proponent], would be the case/would be established [through the same logical reason by the Vyutpattivādin].”

PVinT sat 16a5

PVinT T D17b3–4

Jñ D234b4–5

anīṣṭam avyutpattivādinaḥ sidhyati |
bye brag tu bśad pa yin par smra ba mi ’dod pa ’grub par ’gyur ro ||
’dir raṅ gi ṅo bo tsam gyi don dañ ldan par sgrub par ’dod la rnam par dbye bas ni phyi rol gyi don gys don dañ ldan par ’gyur ba’i phiy mi ’dod pa bsgrub pa’am |

[10] na — mi mtshuṅs

This case is similar to the preceding one. In answer to an objection raised by Dharmakīrti that “it would be the same also elsewhere” (tad anyatrāpi samānam, Tib. de ni gźan la yaṅ [P ’ang] mtshuṅs so), the opponent’s negative reply is introduced in the Sanskrit text by the words na, atra... This was also probably the reading of the version known to Jñānaśrībhadra, as the Tibetan cites the PVin in the form ma yin te. But in the Tibetan canonical translation we find mi mtshuṅs te ’dir. This translation is attested as early as Phya pa’s commentary.

Here also, there is the option of a source-based variant, namely a version of the PVin with the reading *na sāmānam or the option of a translator-based variant due to the influence of Dharmottara’s commentary, where the opponent’s reply is introduced with the expression na samānam (translated as mi mtshuṅs te). In this case, the first option is less likely, because the reply to the objection would be repeating a piece of information that was just given in the objection, a redundancy unlike Dharmakīrti’s synthetic style.

PVinSkt 20,1

PVinT D193a7; P291a8

na, atra...

mi mtshuṅs te ’dir
In the passage under consideration, Dharmakīrti deals with the opponent’s thesis that “the universal is ubiquitous (lit. “all-pervading”). The reason in favor of this thesis is that the universal is “simultaneously connected with its relata that are placed in all loci, like space.”

Dharmakīrti closes the discussion by expressing that the pervasion of this reason by the property to be proven is established. Stated positively in Sanskrit, this corresponds to the expression of the positive entailment (anvaya) of the logical reason: the reason “simultaneously connected” is established for “all-pervading.” The Tibetan translation has a double negation that introduces a subtle difference because it amounts to the statement of the negative entailment (vyatireka), namely the logical reason “simultaneously connected” is not established in the absence of the probandum (i.e., for what is not all-pervading).

Maybe the translator wanted to express such an interpretation (which in this case is not suggested by Dharmottara’s commentary). Alternatively, the Tibetan translation may perhaps be viewed as the result of an initial corruption of yin par into min par (these are likely to be confused in cursive script), followed by a correction of the faulty reading min par ’grub po/ma yin par ’grub po through the addition of a second negation rather than through the removal of the superfluous negation.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PVin\textsubscript{Skt}</th>
<th>1299–10</th>
<th>tasmād bhinnadeśair yugapatsambandhah sarvavyāpini sidhyati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVin\textsubscript{T}</td>
<td>D227b4; P326b4–5</td>
<td>de'i phyir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Therefore, the simultaneous relation with distinct loci is established for what pervades everything/is not established for what does not pervade everything.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVin\textsubscript{T}</td>
<td>D170a6–7</td>
<td>gañ gi phyir de lta yin pa de'i phyir yul tha dad pa dag dañ cig car mñon par 'brel pa ni spyi'i yul thams cad khyab pa yin na grub bo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[2] Different structure

Dharmakīrti explains in a passage that in an inference the logical reason cannot be identical with the subject (for instance, one cannot prove that sound is impermanent because it is a sound). The argument in the Sanskrit version is that “the subject is not a [correct] logical reason because it is not established for both [debaters].” This also appears to have been the reading known to Jñānaśrībhadra, who explicates that “both” refers to the proponent and the opponent.

The Tibetan translation offers the explanation: “Therefore, the subject is not established as a logical reason for both.” This translation appears to have been influenced by Dharmottara’s commentary, not directly on this sentence of the PVin (Dharmottara does not comment on it) but on the part of verse PVin 3.78 that reads tenāsiddhaḥ prakāśitah. Dharmottara explains this phrase as follows: “thus, what is posited as the subject is not established as a logical reason.”

| PVin\textsubscript{Skt} | 100,7 | tasmān na dharmī hetuḥ | ubhayāsid-dheḥ || |
|------------------------|------|------------------|--------------------------|
| PVin\textsubscript{T} | D218b2–3; P316a2 | de'i phyir chos can ni gtan tshigs su gñi ga la ma grub po || |
| Jñ | D275a4 | gñi ga la ma grub pa'i phyir Žes bya ba ni rgol ba dañ phyir rgol ba gñi ga la yan phyogs tha dad pa cuñ zad kyañ ma grub bas so || |
[3] Introduction of explicit links

The Tibetan translation frequently makes explicit the link between different parts of the sentence. It may be rather neutral, like the addition of a coordinating conjunction such as la or ūn, or less neutral, for instance, by suggesting a causal relation. This is the case, for instance, in the translation of the sentence vyastāḥ pramāṇābhyaṃ nirākṛto viparyaye pramāṇavṛttter anāśrayah pratipramāṇasya. This sentence glosses the preceding verse PVin 3.26cd in which the terms vyasta (“eliminated”) and anāśraya (“is not a ground”) occur. The verse, identical with PV 4.91, states that something that has already been excluded is not a proper ground for a reason, i.e., for the application of an inferential reasoning which applies only when there is a doubt.

In the prose sentence vyasta is explained as “opposed by [one of] the two valid cognitions” (pramāṇābhyaṃ nirākṛto), and hetor anāśrayah is glossed as “not the basis for a counter valid cognition” (anāśrayah pratipramāṇasya).

In the Tibetan translation — attested to be Ńog Lo’s translation — the “opposition by one of the two valid cognitions” is given as a reason for the fact that that which is eliminated cannot be the basis for a counter valid cognition by the introduction of the particle pas. This is logically correct but not explicit in Dharmakīrti’s phrasing. Dharmakīrti explicitly states the reason for this fact in terms of “because a valid cognition applies to the opposite” (viparyaye pramāṇavṛttter). Dharmottara’s commentary also takes this part of the sentence to be the reason. According to him, the part “opposed by the two valid cognitions” helps remove the possibility of an antinomic reason.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVin₃₄Skt 293–4</td>
<td>vyastah pramāṇābhyām nirākṛto viparyaye pramāṇa-vṛtter anāśrayaḥ pratipramāṇasya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVin₄ D196a7; P294a7</td>
<td>bsal (D gsal) ba ni tshad ma dag gis bzlog pa yin pas zla po’i tshad ma’i rten ma yin te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“What is eliminated, i.e., opposed by [one of] the two valid cognitions/because it is opposed by [one of] the two valid cognitions, is not a ground for an inverse valid cognition because a valid cognition applies to the opposite.”

| dKa’ gnas 412,20–413,1 | bsal pa ni | zla bo’i tshad ma’i rten ma yin te žes ’brel te | de’i gtan tshigs bzlog pa la tshad ma žugs pa’i phyir žes bya ba’o || gan tshigs gnis pa ’di ŋid ma grub pa spoň ba ni | bsal ba ni tshad ma dag gis bzlog pa yin pas žes sbyar pa ste | des na bzlog pa la tshad mar žugs par khas blaṅ ņo ||

| ’Od zer 166a5–8 | de’i rtags bsgrub pa ni bzlog pa la tshad ma žugs pa’i phyir žes pa’o | [...] des na rtags ’jug pa’i yul ma yin par dam ’cha’ ba na’ăn de daň rtogs pa gcig pa’i zla bo’i tshad ma’i rten ma yin te žes gsuňs pa yin no | [...] de sgrub pa’i rtags kyi rten ma yin pa ci ste Že na bzlog pa la tshad ma žugs pa’i phyir ro žes pas de sgrub po | bzlog pa la tshad ma žugs pa’i tshul ni bsal pa ni žes bya |


| PVinT T D42a1 | gaň gi phyir gtan tshigs kyi rten ma yin par ’gyur la | bsal ba la ci’i phyir gtan tshigs ma brjod ce na | bsad pa | bsal ba ni zla bo’i tshad ma’i rten ma yin no ||

| ci’i phyir rten ma yin Že na | zla bo’i tshad mas bsgrub par bya ba las bzlog pa ’gal ba la tshad ma žugs pa’i phyir ro | gaň gi phyir ’gal ba la tshad ma žugs pa can de ni bsal pa yin te | mñaň bya ma yin pa ŋid bźin no ||
3. Additions

In the critical apparatus to the edition of the PVin, cases such as the ones exemplified below have been qualified as “additions in the Tibetan version.” This is intended to cover all cases where the Tibetan version contains additional terms in comparison with the reading of the Sanskrit manuscripts and/or the critically adopted reading of the Sanskrit version. If a translator-based explanation can be provided, these terms are “added,” strictly speaking. But in the case of a source-based explanation, they simply reflect the reading of a variant Sanskrit source.

[1] *asato virahāt* — *med pa gzung* dañ bral ba’i phyir

In the translation of the Sanskrit phrase *asato virahāt* (“because it is devoid of ‘inexistent’”) one finds an additional *gzung* (lit. “other”). Jñānaśrībhadra cites this portion of the PVin without a similar equivalent (his translation of *asato viraha* is *med pas ston pa*).

Dharmottara’s commentary bears the Sanskrit expression *itarasmād asato* (Tib. *med pa gzung*). In this context indeed, “inexistent” is an alternative to “existent.” This specification was made by Dharmakīrti in a previous passage. Here, in view of Dharmakīrti’s style, the specification in Dharmottara’s commentary is more likely to be a gloss than to reflect a different Sanskrit source for the PVin.

40 Addition by way of intruding glosses can also be envisaged if there is no evidence that the addition was present in the original translation. In such a case one has to postulate that the manuscripts in which such glosses were integrated played a major role in the compilation of the canonical version.

41 PVinSkt 103,7-8: *tenetarāsadvīrāhena tvayopagatavād ity arthah*; PVinT D219a2; P317a4: *des na med pa gzung dañ bral bar khyod kyis khas blaṅs pa’i phyir ro žes bya ba’i don to | že na | “Thus the meaning is “because you accept that it is devoid of the alternative ‘inexistent’.””
Consequently, one can posit a translation-based explanation for this addition in the translation by invoking the influence of the PVinṬ.

| PVin Ṣkt 104.3 | tathāpidam asiddham evāsato virahād iti | vyabhicāri vā ||
| PVin₁ D219a6; P317a8–b1 | de lta na yaṅ med pa gzan daṅ bral ba’i phyir žes bya ba ’di ma grub pa ŋid dam ’khrul par ’gyur ro ||
| PVin Ṣkt 123b2 | <ta>thāpīdam itaras(m)ād asato virahād iti ||
| PVinṬ Ṣkt D137a6 | de lta na yaṅ med pa gzan daṅ bral ba’i phyir ro žes bya ba ’di ma grub pa ŋid do ||
| Jñ D277a7–b1 | de las grol bas ’di rtags su brjod na yaṅ rtags des bsgrub par bya ba med pa thams cad sel bar byed de de lta na yaṅ rtags ’di bsgrub bar bya ba med pas ston pa žes bya bar ’gyur bas | de ŋid bsgrub par bya ba yin pa’i phyir | rtags ma grub pa yin no || yaṅ na ’khrul pa can yin no žes bya ba ni... |

[2] dvasya — ṛtan tshigs gyis po

In this example also the Tibetan translation (as already found in Phya pa’s commentary) has an additional expression that qualifies a word of the sentence (“these two logical reasons”) like in Dharmottara’s commentary, whereas our manuscripts and Jñānāśrībhadra’s commentary lack an equivalent. Here also, the addition of ṛtan tshigs in Tibetan is more likely to be an intruding gloss or a translation influenced by Dharmottara’s commentary.

| PVin Ṣkt 46.6 | asya (variant: tasya) hi dvayasyaikatra samuccayāt... |
| PVin₁ D202b4; P300a5 | ṛtan tshigs gñis po ’di geig la (D las) bsdus pas ni... |
| “Indeed, because of the grouping of these two/logical reasons for one [too restricted property]... |
Another passage involves a longer addition: while the Sanskrit reads abhāvaniścayaḥ ("determination of absence") the Tibetan specifies bsgrub bya med pa las ldog par ņes ("determination of exclusion from [i.e., absence in] what is not a probandum/the absence of the probandum").

In this context, Dharmakīrti’s terms for the notions of absence (abhāva/vyāvrtti) and of non-, opposite of (abhāval/vyatireka) vary. The translation also wavers and uses med pa and ldog pa interchangeably. We can see in Dharmottara’s commentary that the Tibetan bsgrub bya med pa las ldog par ņes translates sādhyavyatirekābhāvaniścayaḥ. The specification is also likely to be a gloss, which echoes the gloss given for ata eva, namely “because the absence of the probandum is doubtful” (sādhyābhāvasaṃdehāt — bsgrub par bya ba med par the tshom za ba).

---

| PVinSkt 101,11–102,1 | tata (variant: tatra) eva katham abhāvaniścayaḥ |
| PVinT D134b2–3; P316b3 | ji ltar de ņid kyis (P kyi) bsgrub bya med pa las (D la) ldog par ņes |
| “For this reason precisely, how could there be determination of absence/of exclusion from what is not to be proven?” |
| PVinSkt 121a6 | tasmāt tata eva sādhyābhāvasaṃdehāt katham sādhyavyatirekābhāvaniścaya<ḥ> |
| PVinT D134b2 | de’i phyir ci ltar bsgrub par bya ba med par the tshom za ba de ņid kyis bsgrub par bya ba med pa las ldog par ņes te |
[4] ∅ — bdag med pa med pas bdag yod par 'gyur bas

The following yet longer addition can be understood as an intruding gloss of yena (Tib. gañ gis na) which reflects the explanation in Dharmottara’s commentary. Indeed, the notion that “since there is no absence of soul, there would be a soul” repeats the argument that appears in the preceding sentence in the PVin: “And thus, a soul is not established for living bodies from the non-absence of soul” (tathāpi nānairātmīyād ātmā jīvaccharīre sidhyati — de lta na yan bdag med pa med pas gson po ‘i lus bdag dañ bcas par mi ’grub po ||).

| PVinSkt | 1234–5 | yenāyāṃ na vyatirekāśābhāvaṃ bhāvam ic-chati |
| PVinT | D225b3–4; P324b2 | gañ gis na bdag med pa med pas bdag yod par 'gyur bas 'di ldog pa med pa dnos por 'dod pa ni ma yin te |

“...by means of which it is not the case that one accepts that this absence of an exclusion amounts to existence insofar as the absence of non-soul would amount to the presence of a soul.”

| PVinTr | D163a3 | ’di ltar bdag med pa bdag ldog pa med pas bdag yod par 'gyur ba rig pa can ’di ldog pa ste | dnos po med pa med par dnos por 'dod pa ni ma yin no ||

[5] saṃhata — ’dus pa ma yin

I deal with this case under the category of “addition” insofar as the difference between the expected and the attested reading amounts to the addition of the negative particle ma in Tibetan. This case was pointed out in the introduction to the edition of PVin 3 as a separative case between the extant manuscripts that share the reading saṃhata and the Sanskrit source used by the translators; indeed, the translation ’dus pa ma yin suggests *asamhata, a reading supported by both Dharmottara’s and Jñānaśrībhadra’s commentaries.

Jñānaśrībhadra appears to have been aware of the two different readings. In such a case, it makes sense to postulate a source-based explanation for the translation. rNog Lo might have been aware of the reading asamhata or might have chosen it as the best reading in the same way the editors of PVin 3 did.
**PVin₃₃, 114,1–2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Tibetan Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nanu saṃhatānām</td>
<td>gaṅ la phan ’dogs par ņes pa med pa’i phyir ma ņes pa yin pas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samhāta°</td>
<td>’gal ba ma yin pa ma yin nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paropakāraniyamābhāvād anaikāntika evety aviruddhā°</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PVin₁, D222b1–2; P321a2–3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Tibetan Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gal te ’dus pa rnam s’ dus pa ma yin pa (D par) gźan la phan ’dogs par ņes pa med pa’i phyir ma ņes pa yin pas</td>
<td>’gal ba ma yin pa ma yin nam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Objection: Since for what is aggregated there is no determination of contributing to something else that is aggregated/not-aggregated, [the reason] is just inconclusive, therefore it is not contradictory.”**

**PVinṬ₃, D151a2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Tibetan Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>’dus pa rnam s’ dus pa la ma yin pa’i gźan gaṅ yin pa de la phan ’dogs par byed pa ņid</td>
<td>’gal ba ma yin no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jñ D280b1–2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Tibetan Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gal te ’dus pa rnam gs’ gźan ’dus pa ma yin pa la phan par ņes bya ba ni ’dus pas ’dus pa ma yin pa’i don byed pa’o</td>
<td>’don to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Tibetan Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kha cig ’dus pa gźan rnam gs’ gźan ’dus pa la phan pa ņes ’don to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[6] pratiṣedhāt — de ma bkag pa’i phyir

This is another case where the Tibetan translation has a negation absent in the extant Sanskrit manuscripts. The translation, which also does not render the ca, indicates that the second ablative is taken as a reason for the first, namely: “it is not negated because it is not proper to negate what does not have an object.” The presence of the negation is here attested in rṆog Lo’s dKa’ gnas and was also adopted by Phya pa. Both authors understand the argument to be about a verbal object posited as the subject when negating something, for instance, “Primordial Nature itself” (gtso bo ņid) when saying “there is no Primordial Nature.” Their understanding is that in such a case there is no possible negation (ma bkag pa) because a negation requires a negandum and “Primordial Nature itself” cannot be one (it is “contradictory as a negandum”).

Dharmottara does not comment on this phrase, which is also absent from the parallel passage in PVSV (105,15–19).
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The Tibetan translation of Jñānaśrībhadra’s commentary supports the negation (but it glosses tasya as “doubt, etc.”), hinting to the existence of an alternative Sanskrit source, which might also have been known to Ṛṇog Lo.

| PVin\textsubscript{Skt} 676–7 | tadarthaprat	extit{i}ṣedhe dharmivācino ‘prayog	extit{a}d abhidhānasya | tasya 	extit{prati}ṣedhāt | nirviṣaya-sya ca pratiṣedhasyāyogāt |
| PVin\textsubscript{T}, D208b4–5; P306a7 | don de dgag pa la chos can brjod pa’i tshig sbyar ba med pa’i phyir te | de 	extit{ma} bkag pa’i phyir yul med pa’i bkag pa mi ruṅ ba’i phyir ro že na |

“Opponent: Because when one negates this object [expressed by the word pradhāna] there is no application for the term expressing the subject, because it is negated/not negated, and because it is not proper to negate what does not have an object.”

| dKa’ gnas 473,5–7 | ‘o na de dgag byar ’gal bas dgag bya med la | des na yul med pa’i dgag pa mi ruṅ no žes brjod pa ni | de 	extit{ma} bkag pa’i phyir žes bya ba’o |
| ‘Od zer 181b4–5 | ‘o na de dgag byar ’gal bas dgag bya med la | des na yul med pa’i dgag pa mi ruṅ no žes brjod pa ni de 	extit{ma} bkag pa’i phyir žes bya ba’o |
| Jñ D261a5 | de bkag par mi ’gyur te žes bya ba ni the tshom la sogs pa dgag par mi ’gyur ba’o |

4. Omissions

There are much fewer pertinent cases of omission (understand: cases where the Tibetan does not have an equivalent for an expression present in our Sanskrit source) than of addition. Cases that lack a word that is essential to the understanding of the text are likely to have been caused by copying mistakes. In other cases, one can invoke two kinds of source-based explanation: the translator had a Sanskrit version lacking a word present in our exemplars or he considered a given word in his Sanskrit version to be an intruding gloss and eliminated it from his “critical” Sanskrit version. A translator-based explanation other than the translator’s carelessness is difficult to adduce for single terms. Note however that in the translation of
the PVinT there are several cases where full sentences are evidently intentionally omitted. They are, notably, grammatical explanations.

[1] *sarva* — ∅

One example of the omission of a single term is the omission in the canonical version of an equivalent for the Sanskrit term *sarva* (“all, every”) attested in all our Sanskrit manuscripts and in the version known to Jñānaśrīribhadra, and mentioned by Dharmottara (although not as a citation of the PVin). In this case, the citation of the phrase of the PVin with the Tibetan expression *thams cad* reflecting the Sanskrit *sarva* is attested in Phya pa's commentary. Chu mig pa does not cite a portion of the PVin with *thams cad*, but uses the expression in his gloss. Thus a likely explanation is that rNog Lo’s original translation also read *gtan tshigs thams cad* and the omission of *thams cad* in the canon is the consequence of a scribal and/or editorial mistake. Alternatively, one can postulate that Phya pa relied on an emended translation and that rNog Lo’s original translation lacked *thams cad*, in spite of the fact that the presence of this word, although not indispensable, provides a much better reading of the sentence.

| PVinSkt 12,8–9 | tathā ca sarvo hetur viruddho drṣṭāntaś ca sādhyavikalāḥ syāt |
| PVinT D190b7–191a1; P288b8 | de lta yin daṅ (P yin na dang) gtan tshigs 'gal ba daṅ dpe bsgrub (D sgrub) par bya bas (D byed pas) ston par 'gyur te |
| ‘Od zer 154b1–2 | de lta na byas pa daṅ rtsod byuṅ lasogs pa phyogs daṅ ldan yaṅ bzlog pas khyab pas na gtan tshigs thams cad 'gal ba daṅ žes smos la | chos de dag dpe’ bum pa la myed pas dpe bsgrub byas ston par 'gyur ste žes smos so |
The canonical Tibetan translation lacks an equivalent for the phrase *saivaśinābhāvaḥ* present in all the extant manuscripts and supported by a gloss in Dharmottara’s commentary. It is possible that the translator relied on a Sanskrit version that lacked this phrase and that the support of the PVinṬ was not sufficient to lead to an emendation. But another possible explanation is, like in the preceding case, that the corresponding Tibetan passage was omitted in the course of the transmission of the translation due to an eye-skip error. Indeed, the translation may have been of the form *de niid me na mi byui ba,* thereby starting with the same syllables as the next sentence *de niid kyis ni rjes su ’gro ba grub pa’i phyir.*

---

42 A similar explanation was proposed for the omission of the phrase *lakṣaṇam/talalakṣaṇam sarva/sarvatra pratītirodhānām* (PVin₅ 38,8) in the Tibetan translation. See the discussion in the introduction to the edition of PVin 3, xxxv–vi.
“This [presence of breath in what has a soul which is not mixed with what
does not have a soul] is precisely invariably related [with soul].”

\[ PVin^T \text{ T D155b2 bdag la srog la sogs pa'i gnas pa de 'dra ba ni bdag med na mi 'byuṅ ba yin no} \]

**Conclusion**

In continuity with earlier discussions by Seyfort Ruegg (1992) and Franco (1997), my comparative study of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the PVin adduces further evidence against the myth of automated translation that leads one to consider the Tibetan version as a mirror copy of the Sanskrit.\(^{43}\) Some things get lost in translation,\(^{44}\) but things also get added. While the translator’s competence and precision may contribute to an overall impression that his translation is a mirror copy of the source, the present study highlights another aspect of the translator’s contribution, his input as an interpreter of the text being translated. This input can be reflected in the choice of the Sanskrit reading to be translated as well as in the choice of the translation, which may end up conveying a meaning

\(^{43}\) Seyfort Ruegg points to this tendency in his article on the translation of Buddhist philosophical texts (1992: 382): “But has it not often been claimed that the Tibetan Lotsābas developed a special form of the Tibetan language in which they imitated and calqued the terminology, and very often even the syntax, of their Indian source-texts? And have we not sometimes heard it said that their translations differ radically for example from the majority of Chinese translations of Buddhist texts, and especially from the earlier Chinese translations using the method of ‘meaning-matching’ (\(\text{ko-i}\)) by being not only highly technical but also mechanical?”

\(^{44}\) Steinkellner 1988: 106–107 points in particular to the lack of precision that can follow from working with texts exclusively available in Tibetan. He recalls notably that one Tibetan term can be found to translate several original Sanskrit words, and that the Tibetan often does not differentiate meaningful morphological variations of a Sanskrit term (such as causative, abstract, etc.). In his 1980: 97 he states that “due to the schematic and concept-orientated simplified wording, these translations are paradoxically quite often ambiguous, lacking the conceptual colours of the corresponding Sanskrit expression in the originals.”
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not explicit in the source.\textsuperscript{45} On this account, rNyog Lo appears to have been influenced in particular by Dharmottara’s commentary on the PVin. Vetter (1966: 8) had already pointed out that the translation of some verses of the PVin is clearly directed by Dharmottara’s explanations. I have shown that this influence extended to the translation of the prose passages, directing the choice of terms and on occasion motivating the inclusion of additional expressions. The same mechanism is at play in rNyog Lo’s translation of the PVinṬ. Since there is no Indian commentary on this work, we may hypothesize here that the corresponding influential role was played by the paṇḍits surrounding rNyog Lo and contributing to the translation process.

The observation of this phenomenon in the case of rNyog Lo suffices to demonstrate the importance of having access to the material in its original Sanskrit version for studying the thought of Dharmakīrti. In contrast, the Tibetan translation primes when studying the influence of Dharmakīrti’s text in Tibet, since it is the translated form of the text which includes a primary level of interpretation through the translator’s input that shapes the course of Tibetan epistemology.

Acknowledging the role of the translator allowed us to suggest a translation-based explanation for numerous cases where the Tibetan translation was observed to differ from an expected translation.

\textsuperscript{45} The specificity of rNyog Lo’s translation of the PVin demonstrates that he was not carrying out an automatized task, but relied on an in-depth understanding of the source text and attempted to transmit a readable form in Tibetan. The latitude he takes in translating the PVinṬ appears to be even greater, especially as far as the structure of long and complex sentences is concerned. Yet in an informal communication, my colleague Masamichi Sakai pointed out to me that that rNyog Lo’s translation of the PVA displays a more rigid translation that matches the Sanskrit text very precisely. One can note also that grammatical explanations of Sanskrit expressions are translated in the PVA, whereas they are systematically left out of the Tibetan translation in PVinṬ 3 and often omitted in PVinṬ 2 (Sakai 2010: viii). Krasser (informal communication) emitted the hypothesis that this is due to the fact that the translation of the PVA had been carried out early in rNyog Lo’s career, whereas the translation of the PVin and PVinṬ was the product of a more mature and independent scholar.
of the extant Sanskrit version as an alternative to a source-based explanation. Although both options remain possible in most cases, I would like to advocate a “principle of economy.” This principle would direct that we need not systematically postulate a ghost diverging version of the Sanskrit text, especially when a Tibetan reading can be explained by appealing to factors of influence that are clearly identifiable and there is no strong support for postulating a variant source.

Taking at face value translation-based explanations is not without consequences on editorial procedures. The Tibetan version — in particular when dealing with translators of rNog Lo’s level — remains an invaluable tool when the Sanskrit text is corrupt or when dealing with a single manuscript that is damaged. But its relation to the Sanskrit version it was based on remains opaque when the latter is not available. The Tibetan version can thus suggest a Sanskrit reading — this “suggestion” can have more or less weight according to the translator’s method, parallel passages, etc. — but it is not the witness of a Sanskrit reading in the same degree that, for instance, a copy of a Sanskrit manuscript would be. We must therefore be careful as to the importance we are willing to give to the Tibetan translation for supporting reading choices and emendations in a critical edition of the Sanskrit version, and for reconstructing lacking portions in a Sanskrit text. The presence or absence of an expression in the Tibetan translation neither guarantees that the calque expression was present in the translator’s source, nor that it represents the better reading to be adopted in the critical edition of the Sanskrit text. The accuracy of the reconstruction of a Sanskrit passage can reach a high degree of probability when relying on identical or quasi-identical passages in Tibetan by the same translator, passages for which the Sanskrit version is available. Nevertheless even this method does not yield absolute certainty. As already mentioned, the same Tibetan translation may be adopted for slightly different Sanskrit expressions or phrases. Also, the possibility of intruding glosses and other marks of the translator’s input may not be identifiable when no Sanskrit version is available for comparison.
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