

Sanskrit manuscripts in China II

Proceedings of a panel at the 2012 Beijing
Seminar on Tibetan Studies, August 1 to 5

Edited by

Horst Lasic, Xuezhu Li

China Tibetology Publishing House
Beijing 2016

For Helmut Krasser (1956–2014)



Contents

<i>Preface</i>	7
前言	11
•	
Junjie CHU & Eli FRANCO	
<i>Rare manuscripts of works by Jitāri</i>	15
Pascale HUGON	
<i>On the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the Pramāṇa- viniścaya: A look into the translator's workshop of rÑog Blo ldan śes rab</i>	49
Kazuo KANO & Xuezhu LI	
<i>Sanskrit verses from Candrakīrti's Triśaraṇasaptati cited in the Munimatālaṃkāra</i>	115
Birgit KELLNER	
<i>The concept of ākāra in early Sāṅkhya epistemology: An evaluation of fragments</i>	127
Horst LASIC	
<i>Dignāga and the Ṣaṣṭitantra: Philological observations on a text criticized in the Pramāṇasamuccaya</i>	155
Zhen LIU	
<i>The Dharmadhātustava found in TAR.</i>	173
Kazunobu MATSUDA	
<i>A Sanskrit manuscript of Sthiramati's commentary to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya</i>	223
FRANCESCO SFERRA & Hong LUO	
<i>Materials for the study of the Paramārthasevā by Puṇḍarīka.</i> . . .	231



Shaoyong YE, Xuezhu LI & Kazuo KANO

Further folios from the set of miscellaneous texts in Śāradā script on palm leaves from Zha lu Ri phug: A preliminary report based on photographs preserved in the CTRC, CEL and IsIAO 245

•

Contributors 271



On the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*

A look into the translator's workshop of rÑog Blo Idan
śes rab¹

Pascale Hugon, Vienna

Introduction

The contribution of rÑog Blo Idan śes rab (1059–1109) (hereafter: rÑog 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 rÑog 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 gSañ phu Ne'u thog.²

Tibetan epistemologists in rÑog 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' gdams 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 rÑog Lo's life and works see Kramer 2007.

Horst Lasic, Xuezhong 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 rÑog Lo, Parahitabhadrā and anonymous “others” while rÑog 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 Jñānaśrībhadrā’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 Jñānaśrībhadrā’s own commentary, the deed of Jñānaśrībhadrā himself together with Khyuñ po Chos kyi brtson ’grus.⁵ More research will be necessary to ascertain whether it had any impact.⁶

rÑog 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). rÑog Lo’s biography by Gro lung pa confirms this information (ibid., p. 103–104). The colophon groups the “others” with Parahitabhadrā (*pañḍita gźan la phan pa bzan po la sogs pa dan / bod kyi lo tsā ba blo ldan śes 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 Parahitabhadrā and the anonymous “others” had in this task, I refer for simplicity’s sake to this translation as “rÑog 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 gyi ño mtshar gtam gyi legs bśad mkhas pa’i ’jug ñogs*, 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 gSañ 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 gsuñ ’bum*, vol. 87, 5–307. Chu mig pa indicates in the colophon of this work that he knew Jñānaśrībhadrā’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 rÑog 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 PVinṬ now enables a detailed comparison with the Tibetan translation. While this comparison confirms the high quality of rNog 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 rNog 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 rNog 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 rNog 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 rNog 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 rÑog 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 rÑog Lo, who

cal version is merely extracted from the translation of Vinītadeva's commentary, with slight revisions but no perceptible effort at improving on the translation. On the possibilities of retrieving parts of the "original version" of rÑog Lo's revised version of the *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, see also Hugon 2014.

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 rNog 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 rNog 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 *viśeṣyajñānāviśeṣād* (probably due to an eye-skip error), whereas the Tibetan (*khyad par gyi śes pa dan khyad par can gyi śes pa khyad par med pa'i phyir*) supports the correct reading *viśeṣaṇajñānāviśeṣyajñānāviśeṣād*, and (ii) the presence in the Tibetan of the phrase *de dan bral ba'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, rÑog 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 rÑog 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.¹⁰ 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 rÑog 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.¹¹

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.¹² A single (incom-

¹⁰ In the colophon of some translations revised by rÑog Lo one finds mention of the use of exemplars of the text. For instance, the colophon of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* specifies that rÑog 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 kyī dpe dum bsags nas gtan 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

plete) 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;¹³ 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: PVin_{Skt} 1,2–3 (prose passage on PVin 3.1ab); PVin_T D187a7–b1; P285a7–8¹⁴

commentarial literature.

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 liṅ-
gini jñānam utpannam, tathā paratra
liṅgjñānotpipādayiṣayā trirūpaliṅgā-
khyānaṃ parārtham anumānam

ji ltar rañ ñid tshul gsum pa'i rtags las
rtags can la (P las) śes pa skyes pa
kho na ltar gzan la rtags can gyi śes
pa bskyed par 'dod pas tshul gsum
pa'i rtags (P rtag) ston par byed pa ni
gzan gyi don gyi rjes su dpag pa ste |

Dharmottara's commentary: PVinT_{Skt} 1b4–6 (reading of the manu-
script); 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 **trirū-
pāt** trīṇi rūpāni yasya tasmāl **liṅgini**
parokṣe 'rthe ātmano **jñānam utpan-
nam tathā** tenaivarthakrameṇa **para-
tra** parasantāne **liṅgino** 'rthasya yaj
**jñānam tasyotpipādayiṣayā trirūpa-
liṅgasya** yad **ākhyānaṃ** prakāśanaṃ
tat **parārtham anumānam**

ji ltar rañ ñid ces smos te |

ji ltar te don gyi tshul^a gañ gis **tshul
gsum pa** ste | tshul gsum gañ la
yod pa'i rtags de las **rtags can** lkog
tu gyur pa'i don la bdag ñid **śes pa
bskyed pa** de **kho na ltar** te | don gyi
rim pa de ñid kyis **gzan la** ste rgyud
gzan dag la **rtags can gyi** don gyi **śes
pa** gañ yin pa de **bskyed par 'dod pas
tshul gsum pa'i rtags ston par byed
pa** ste | gsal bar byed pa gañ yin pa
de **ni gzan 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 PVinT. If rÑog 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 PVinT (so far D and P have been consulted) lack a translation for phrases present in our Sanskrit exemplar.¹⁶ 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 PVinT will show whether some of them could be glosses by rÑog 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.¹⁷ Other cases suggest another manuscript with a variant reading.¹⁸

¹⁶ For example: *etad uktaṃ bhavati na vayaṃ brūma ekatvasyānekatvam avasīyam evan tu brūmo nekatvavyāptasya sambhava vyāpakasambhava eṣitavyo vyāpakābhāv{o}e <vā> vyāpyābhāva iti* | (PVinT_{Skt} 8a3–4); *so rthas tat-sāmarthyena vyāptas* (PVinT_{Skt} 17b2); *dvayoś ca bhōjanīyatvaviśeṣayoḥ pratiśedhe* (PVinT_{Skt} 19a6); *asparśatvasya hy anvayo vya{ti}rekasahāyaḥ* | (PVinT_{Skt} 103a3); the expressions *gamayan* and *nānyatheti* in the Tibetan translation of the sentence *hetur vipakṣavyāvṛttiṃ gamayan^o prakṛtasya sādhyasya gamako bhavati nānyatheti śeṣaiḥ pakṣadharmmair ayam arthaḥ kathyate* | (PVinT_{Skt} 71b5; PVinT_T D75b45, P89a6–7: *phyogs kyi chos 'di rnams kyis ni mi mthun pa'i phyogs las ldog pa dan ldan pa'i gtan tshigs ni skabs su bab pa'i bsgrub bya go bar byed pa yin no źes bya ba'i don 'di brjod pa yin no ||*).

¹⁷ For instance, the phrase *de ltar 'gyur gyi źes bya ba ni grub par 'gyur gyi'o* || (PVinT_T D22a7; P25b7), which refers to *evaṃ syāt* in PVin_{Skt} 174; or *gcig nam par gcad pa ñid gnas pa yin pa'i phyir* | *mñan bya ñid go byed du 'gyur ro* || (PVin_T D71a5).

¹⁸ For instance, the translation *gal te de ltar yin na źes bya ba ni the tshom med pa'i phyir ro* || (PVinT_T D10a2; P11b7) for *yadi evam iti sandehenābhīdhānā{va}d iti* | (PVin_{Skt} 9a6), which suggests that the translator read **sandehebābhāvā*.

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 khañ). 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

¹⁹ Harrison 1996: 91, n. 55.

texts than the Peking or sNar thang prints. The Co ne edition (1753–1773) was based on the sDe dge; complete in 209 volumes, it lacks the later additions. To these must be added the two incomplete editions made at Uрга or Ulan Bator (1937) and Wa ra (ca. 1945), both of which are also based on sDe dge.

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 rÑog 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 rÑog Lo in Kashmir, or even of the text established by rÑog 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 rÑog Lo’s translation. Van der Kuijp identifies the editor — who is referred to as “sTag sde pa” in an inter-linear note — as the thirteenth-century sTag sde pa Señ ge rgyal mtshan (1212–1294).

successive copies of the first-generation translation. However there may be some hope of getting closer to rÑog Lo's original version.

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

The surfacing of rÑog 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, rÑog 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 rÑog Lo was the second abbot) are also of interest in this regard, because it is quite likely that their authors knew rÑog Lo's translation.

In order to assess the contribution this newly recovered material can make to retrieving rÑog Lo's first-generation translation, I have collected all the explicit quotations of words from PVin 3 in rÑog 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 *dKa' gnas*, only parts of the PVin are explained. But Phya pa's *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.²¹

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” (*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” (*'di la*) and “there” (*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 ways²²; they may have adopted the same divisions of the root text but relied on translations

²¹ On this text see Hugon 2009a and 2009b.

²² On this topic see Hugon 2009a: 65ff.

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.

<i>dKa' gnas</i> 380,4–5; Ms A 93a6	rgyu las 'bras bu btags pa'i phyir ro
<i>dKa' gnas</i> Ms B 104a3	rgyu la 'bras bu btags pa'i phyir ro
The reading of Ms B is supported by	
PVin _{Skt} 1,3–4	kāraṇe kāryopacārāt
' <i>Od zer</i> 143b7	rgyu la 'bras bu btags pa'i phyir ro
PVin _T D187b1; P285a8	rgyu la 'bras bu btags (P brtags) pa'i phyir ro
The confusion of <i>la</i> and <i>las</i> is a frequent scribal mistake.	

<i>dKa' gnas</i> 437,12; Ms A 106b3	don rnam par dgag par mi nus pa'i phyir ro
<i>dKa' gnas</i> Ms B 118b3	don rnams la dgag par mi nus pa'i phyir ro
The reading of Ms B is supported by	
PVin _{Skt} 35,5	' rtheṣv aśakyapraṭiṣedhatvād
' <i>Od zer</i> 171a1	don rnams la dgag par mi nus pa'i phyir ro
PVin _T D198b4; P296b2	don rnams 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:

<i>dKa' gnas</i> 401,6	de ni ji ltar
<i>dKa' gnas</i> Ms A 98a5	da ni ji ltar
The reading of Ms A is supported by	
PVin _{Skt} 12,1	katham idānīm aśrūyamāṇaḥ

<i>dKa' gnas</i> Ms B 108b7	da ni ji ltar
' <i>Od zer</i> 154a2	da ni ji ltar ma thos na
PVin _T D190b4; P288b3	da ni ji ltar ma thos na

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

' <i>Od zer</i> 187b1	de ni
but	
PVin _{Skt} 82,10	tatra hi
<i>dKa' gnas</i> 491,13	de la ni
<i>bsDus pa</i> 198a5	de la ni
PVin _T D213a4, P319b7	de la ni
Omission of <i>la</i> , or copying mistake of <i>der</i> .	

' <i>Od zer</i> 186a7	'di gañ žig mi mthun phyogs su gtogs
but	
PVin _{Skt} 78,1	kaṃ punar atra bhavān vipakṣaṃ pratyeti
<i>bsDus pa</i> 197b5	'dir
PVin _T D211b7; P309b2	'dir gañ žig mi mthun pa'i phyogs su gtogs
Copying mistake of ' <i>dir</i> .	

(c) Faulty readings in the *bsDus don*

<i>bsDus don</i> 12a4	de ci ni
but	
PVin _{Skt} 102,6	tat kim idānīm pakṣo 'pi vipakṣaḥ
' <i>Od zer</i> 191a5	de ci da ni phyogs kyañ
PVin _T D218b4; P316b5	de ci da ni phyogs kyañ
Omission of <i>da</i> .	

<i>bsDus don</i> 12a4	gañ la skyon
but	
PVin _{Skt} 102,8–9	na ca hetoḥ sambandhopadarśa- nakāle pakṣādivikalpo 'sti, yato 'yaṃ doṣaḥ syāt
' <i>Od zer</i> 191a8	gañ las skyon 'dir 'gyur ba
<i>bsDus pa</i> 202a8	gañ las
PVin _T D218b5; P316b6–7	gañ las skyon 'dir 'gyur ba
Confusion of <i>la</i> and <i>las</i> .	

(d) Faulty readings in the *bsDus pa*

<i>bsDus pa</i> 206a4	dañ ni
but	
PVin _{Skt} 123,11	kim idānīṃ nairātmyād
PVin _T D225b5; P332b4	da ni bdag med pa las
Possibly confusion of a <i>tsheg</i> for a final <i>-i</i> .	

<i>bsDus pa</i> 166b1	yid pa'i
but	
PVin _{Skt} 3,8	san khalv apy arthaḥ
PVin _T D188a2; P286a2	yod pa'i don ni
Here the scribal mistake can be explained by the occurrence of the expression <i>blo yid spyod las</i> earlier in the sentence in the <i>bsDus pa</i> .	

<i>bsDus pa</i> 201a2	de rañ yañ
but	
PVin _{Skt} 92,10	tatrāpi hi
PVin _T D215b7; P313b3	der yañ

The mistake can possibly be explained by a confusion of a *tsheg* with *ra* or *-ñi* and the proximity of the expression *gžan 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:

PVin _T D193a2; P291a2 but	de'i phyir chos 'ga' žig kho na
PVin _{Skt} 18,9 <i>dKa' gnas</i> 480,21–481,1	tasmāt kevala eva dharmo rnam ñes 'di ñid de'i phyir chos 'ba' žig kho na

PVin _T D209a3; P306b5 but	don de ni
PVin _{Skt} 68,8 <i>dKa' gnas</i> 474,19 <i>bsDus don</i> 11a3	na ca sa evārthaḥ don de ñid don de ñid

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* (*prati-patti*, *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 rÑog Lo (or on a version deriving from it) and followed to a large extent also rÑog Lo's analysis of the source text.

There is, however, a third category of variants that indicates that rÑog 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

[1]	PVin_{skt} 9,5 (PVin 3.5) pakṣoktiḥ
<i>dKa' gnas</i> 378,21; Ms A 93a2; Ms B 103b6	phyogs kyi ñag
(citation of PVin 3.4–5)	
' <i>Od zer</i> 151a9	phyogs tshig
	(to be emended to <i>phyogs kyi tshig</i> for the sake of metrics)
PVin _t D190a2; P288a1	phyogs kyi tshig

PVin_T D14a5; P16b6 (Skt. 13a4 *phyogs kyi tshig pakṣoktiḥ*)

The translation *phyogs kyi tshig* appears to be influenced by the translation of *paḥṣavacana* as *phyogs kyi tshig* in the preceding sentences.

[2]

PVin_{Skt} 70,3 avadhatte

dKa' gnas 475,2; Ms A 115a2; Ms B lhur len pa
129a1

PVin_T D209b3; P307a5 lhur gñer ba

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

[3]

PVin_{Skt} 18,10 samudāyasya

dKa' gnas 481,2; Ms A 116a7; Ms B tshogs pa
130b5

'*Od zer* 157a6 spyi

PVin_T D193a2; P291a2 spyi

PVin_T D25b4; P29b1 (PVin_{Skt} 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 PVin_T D25b2; P29a7 (PVin_{Skt} 23b5).

[4]

PVin_{Skt} 66,6 tattve

dKa' gnas 471,10; Ms A 113a4; Ms B de ñid la
127b8

'*Od zer* 181a5 de ñid la

PVin_T D208a7; P306a2 de ñid du

The translation *de ñid la* appears to be inspired by Dharmottara's interpretation of *tattve* as *padārthatatvasya* (PVin_{Skt} 90b4), translated *dños po de ñid la* (PVin_T D94b1; P112a1).

[5] **PVinSkt 82,7 (PVin 3.63) hetunā**

dKa' gnas 488,11; Ms A 118a4; Ms B 132b7 rgyu las

'*Od zer* 187a2 rgyu las

PVinT D213a4; P310b7 rgyu yis

The choice of the ablative may have been influenced by the translation of the similar verse PV 1.7. This verse reads *hetunā samagrēna* 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 *rgyū nus pas* in the canon, but as *rgyu nus pa las* in '*Od zer* 187a2 and in the citation of the words of the PVin in PVinT_T D113a7; P133a5 (PVinT_{Skt} 104b8–105a1).

[6] **PVin_{Skt} 73,5 sādhyatām**

dKa' gnas 482,17; Ms A 116b6; Ms B 131a4 bsgrub par bya ba yin mod

'*Od zer* 184b5 bsgrub bya yin mod kyi

bsDus pa 196b1 bsgrub par bya ba yin mod

PVin_T D210b1; P308a3 bsgrub par bya ba yin du zad mod

PVinT_T D102b5; P121a6 (no Skt. available) bsgrub par bya ba yin mod

Purely stylistic variation.

[7] **PVinSkt 6,12 anyathābhyupagamyā**

'*Od zer* 150b2 de lta ma yin na

bsDus pa 168a1 g'zan du khas blañs

PVin_T D189a5; P287a5 de lta ma yin na ni khas blañs

Jñ D232a5 g'zan du khas blañs zes bya ba smos te | grub pa'i mtha' las g'zan du spyi med par khas blañs nas

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.²³ 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 rÑog Lo revise his translation even after composing the *dKa' gnas*? rÑog 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 PVin 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 rÑog Lo's first-generation translation. On the other hand, readings found in other early commentaries that postdate rÑog 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 PVin. 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

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]).²⁴

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, rÑog 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:

Source text

PVin _{Skt} 4,4	PVin _T P286a5; D188a5
yas tu paraparikalpitaiḥ prasaṅgaḥ	gʒan gyis kun brtags (P btags) pas thal ba bsgrub pa... gañ yin pa

Dharmottara's commentary

PVin _{Skt} 5b7	PVinṬ _T P7b2; D6b1
yas tv iti...	gʒan gyis źes smos so

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 syntactic tables akin to Phya pa's *bsDus don* on the PVin. rNog 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 concurs 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 rÑog Lo and on the other hand of the Tibetan translation as it was established by rÑog Lo. As for the first, none of the extant manuscripts appear to be candidates for rÑog Lo’s Sanskrit source. Further, we do not even know the nature of rÑog 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 rÑog 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 rÑog 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 rÑog Lo’s translation of PVinT 2.

the translation that I will ascribe to rÑog 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 rÑog 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 rÑog 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) rÑog 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 *śin* in a translation whereas the extant Sanskrit manuscripts read *śimśapā*, it is a source-related difference if the translator was not

actually translating the word *śiṃśapā*, but intended to translate the word *taru*; however, it is a translator-related difference if he was actually proposing that *śiṃ* should translate *śiṃśapā* 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.²⁷ Regarding the PVin, it suffices to compare rNog Lo and Parahitabhadra's translation with the portions cited in Jñānaśrībhadrā's commentary, which was translated by Jñānaśrībhadrā himself and Khyuñ po Chos kyī 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 *Prajñāpāramitāstotra*, 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 PVin_T^{Skt} 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* (PVin_T^T D217b5; P315b4), while Jñānaśrī and Khyuñ po translate it as *mar me* (Jñ D274b4).²⁸ 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.²⁹ 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*

rÑog Lo translates the expression *avasthāntarāveśāt* as *gnas skabs gžan dan '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”).³⁰

In the PVinT, Dharmottara uses the expression *avasthāntareṇa saṃsargād* “due to combination/union with another condition (*avasthā*),” translated as *gnas skabs gžan dan '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 rÑog Lo had adopted *avasthāntarasamsargāt* as their source text. The latter (more likely in my opinion) would be that they both had adopted the reading *avasthāntarāveśāt*. Dharmottara

²⁹ The *Mahāvvyutpatti* prescribes *mar me* for *dīpaḥ* (6117), and *sgron ma* to translate *pradīpaḥ* in various compounds.

³⁰ PVSV_{Skt} 165,11–13: *teṣām aviditārthanīyamānām atyakṣāveśād avidvān eva doṣopaplavaḥ kaścit tattvaṃ vyācaṣṭe nāpara iti na nyāyyam*. PVSV_T D358b4–5; P525b5–6: *lkog tu gyur pa goms₍₅₎ pa'i phyir ñes pas bslad (P slad) ciñ mi mkhas pa 'ga' žig don ñes pa rigs pa med pa can de dag de kho na ñid du 'chad par byed pa₍₆₎ yin la | gžan ni ma yin no žes bya bar rigs pa ma yin no ||*

glossed *āveśāt* with *saṃsargāt*. As for rÑog 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 (PVin_{Skt} 48,6–7).

PVin _{Skt} 94,4	vastv ekam evāvasthāntarāveśād bhedadṛṣṭir iti cet
PVin _T D216a7–b1; P314a5	dños po gcig ñid gnas skabs g’zan dañ ’brel pa’i phyir tha dad par mñon par yin no že na
“Objection: One conceives the distinction (between <i>avasthā</i> and <i>avasthātā</i>) because a unique entity can enter/be joined with another condition (<i>avasthā</i>).”	
PVin _T _{Skt} 115a1	<i>avasthāntareṇa saṃsarggād bhedadṛṣṭir bhavati</i>
PVin _T _T D126b2; P148a7	<i>gnas skabs g’zan dañ ’brel pa’i phyir tha dad par mñon pa yin</i>

PVin _{Skt} 48,6–7	na hi sa eva brāhmaṇas tajiṭiyoḡād abrahmaṇas ca dharmāntarasamāveśāl loke pratīyate
PVin _{Tib} D203a6–7; P300b8	de’i rigs dañ ldan pa’i phyir de ñid bram ze yin la chos g’zan dañ ’brel pa’i phyir de ñid bram ze ma yin pa yañ 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 (<i>yoga</i>) with the universal of this [i.e., of Brahmin-hood] and not a Brahmin because he is endowed by/joined with (<i>samāveśa</i>) another property [i.e., a property other than being a Brahmin].”	
PVin _T _{Skt} 70b4	<i>abrāhmaṇas ca brāhmanyād dharmmāntareṇa samāveśāt⁰</i>
PVin _T _T D74b2; P87b8	bram ze las chos g’zan pa dañ ’brel ba’i phyir bram ze ma yin pa yañ yin no zes...
Jñ D253b6	chos g’zan dañ ldan pa ni ser skya’am mañ du za ba’am riñ ba ñid dañ ño

[2] *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 rÑog 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 vyavahārah* — *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.³¹

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.

³¹ Note that Jñānaśrī proceeds to the same reformulation, as he rephrases *dpyod pa’i gźir byed pa med* as *gzi tha sñad byed pa ni med de*.

PVin _{Skt} 24,10–11	na hi tathoparacito 'prasiddharūpasāmānyo viśe- śāśrayaṃ vicāraṃ āśrayate
PVin _{Tib} D194b7–195a1; P292b7	de ltar rab tu bkod pa'i ño bo mtshuñs 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
“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 _{T_{Skt}} 32b2–4	nanu ya {še} d evārthakāri ta {ya} d eva siddhānte [em. siddāntena] viśiṣṭaṃ kalpitam tat katham avicā {dha} ryaṃ ity āha <i>na hīti</i> yasmāt <i>tathā</i> hi svecchayā <i>upacarito</i> yo dharmy <i>aprasiddham</i> anubhavena <i>rūpasāmānyam</i> ubhayor vṛvādiprativādinor yasya <i>viśeṣa āśrayo</i> yasya vy- vahārasya viruddhadharmābhyupagamalakṣaṇa- sya tan <i>nāśrayate</i>
PVin _{T_T} D34b7–35a1	gal te don byed pa gañ yin pa de ñid khyad par can du grub pa'i mtha' brtags pa ma yin nam de ci ltar rnam par dpyad par bya ba ma yin ze na <i>de ltar</i> zes smos so gañ gi phyir chos can gañ žig rañ gi 'dod pas <i>ñe</i> <i>bar bkod pa'i</i> rgol ba dañ phyir rgol ba gñi ga la <i>ño bo mtshuñs par</i> ñams su myoñ bar <i>ma grub pa</i> gañ yod pa ni <i>khyad par gyi rten</i> gañ la yod pa'i tha sñad 'gal ba'i chos khas len pa'i mtshan ñid can de 'i <i>rten ma yin pa'i phyir ro</i>
Jñ D242a5–7	gal te rañ gi mtshan ñid ma yin pa dag kyañ dgag pa'i phyir dpyod par byed pa ma yin nam ze na <i>de bžin du</i> zes bya ba smos te rañ gi mtshan ñid gñi ga la grub pa'i gži med pa de bžin du'o rgol ba dañ phyir rgol la spyir grub pa'o 'di'i rañ bžin ji lta bu zes dpyod pa'i gžir byed pa med de gži ma grub pa'i phyir ro de'i phyir gži tha sñad byed pa ni med de spyir mthun pa'i tha sñad bya bar mi nus pa'i phyir ro de lta bas na brtags pa dag dgag par bya bar ni rigs kyi rtags kyi gžir bya ba ni ma yin no rañ ñid kyi sgras ni rtags kyi yul ston pa'i phyir ro

rNam nges ṭi ka 93b7–8 rtag mi rtag *de ltar rab du bkod pa'i* chos can gyi
ño bo rgol phyir rgol 2 ka la *mtshuis par ma grub*
pa can nam mkha'i yon gyi sgra dag *ni khyad par*
chos kyi ste chos rten pa can chos can gyi ***tha sñad***
kyi rten chos can *ma yin* par tshad mas ñes pa'i
phyir ro ||

[3] *sambaddha* — *med na mi 'byuñ*

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 *anantarīyaka(tā)* 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 bādhanam*, 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 *nāntarīyakabādhanam*. But the PVA gives the verse in the form *sambaddhasyaiva bādhanam*, also translated with *med na mi 'byuñ* in the canonical Tibetan version of the PVA. *Sambaddhasyaiva bādhanam* also appears in Prajñākara Gupta's gloss on this verse but is this time translated as *'brel pa ñid kyi*.

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 dharmaḥ* (“the property that has a connection”). But in the Tibetan trans-

lation *sambaddhasya* is translated as *'brel pa'i chos*, while *sambandhī dharmah* is rendered with *med na mi 'byuñ ba'i chos*.

The Tibetan version of Jñānaśrībhadrā'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 PVinT, 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.

PVin _{Skt} 3.13ab (21,10)	tatrāpi sādhyadharmasya sambaddhasya iva bādhanam parihāryam
PVin _{Tib} D193b7; P291b7	der (P de) yañ bsgrub bya'i chos dañ ni med na mi 'byuñ la gnod ñid spañ par bya
	“In this case, too, [when one adopts a treatise] the invalidation of what is precisely linked/invariably related with the property to be proven is to be avoided.” ³²
PVinT _{Skt} 28a5–6	tatrapi [em.: tatrāpi] śāstraparigrahe sādhyadhar- mmasya yaḥ sambandhī dharmmah kṣaṇikatvasya nairātmyam sambaddhan tasyaiva sambaddhasya yad bādhakan tat pariharttavayam
PVinT _T D30a7	bstan bcos yoñs su len pa <i>der yañ</i> dper na skad cig ma ñid dañ bdag med pa 'brel pa lta <i>bsgrub bya'i</i> <i>chos dañ</i> med na mi 'byuñ ba'i chos gañ yin pa ste 'brel pa'i chos de la gnod pa gañ yin pa de ñid spoñ bar bya ba yin te
Jñ D204b1	luñ gis brtsad pa <i>de la yañ bsgrub bya'i chos kyis ni</i> <i>'brel bar 'gyur ba ste</i> stoñ pa ñid kyi 'brel pa mi rtag pa dañ sdug bsñal ba la sogs pa lta bu'i chos gañ med na bsgrub par bya ba stoñ pa ñid mi 'byuñ ba dag <i>la gnod pa'i lan gdab po</i>
PV _{Skt} 4.52	tatrāpi sādhyadharmasya nāntarīyakabā dhanam parihāryam

³² Cf. the translation of PV 4.52 in Tillemans 2000: 83.

PV _T 4.52	der yañ bsgrub bya'i chos dañ ni med na mi 'byuñ la gnod ñid spañ bar bya
PVA _{Skt} 505,16–19	tatrāpi sādhyadharmasya sambaddhasyaiva bā- dhanam parihāryaṃ tasmāt sādhyadharmas sambaddhasyaiva bādha- naṃ parihāryaṃ
PVA _T D157a3–4	der yañ bsgrub bya'i chos dañ ni med na mi 'byuñ la gnod ñid spañ bar bya de'i phyir bsgrub par bya ba'i chos dañ 'brel pa ñid kyis gnod pa spañ bar bya ba'i...

[4] *dravya* — *gsal ba*

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 Saṃkṛtyāyana’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*.³³ 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_T, a specific understanding of the term in this context.

PVin _{Skt} 4,4–5	deśakālāvasthāviśeṣaniyataikad ^r dravyasam- sargāvyavacchinnaśabhāvāntaravirahād
PVin _T D188a5–6; P286a5–6	yul dañ dus dañ gnas skabs kyi khyad par ñes pa'i gsal ba gcig dañ 'dres pas rnam par ma bcad pa rañ bžin gžan gyis stoñ pa'i 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]	
PVin _T _{Skt} 6a4–6	[mostly illegible]
PVin _T D6b7–7a2	yul dañ dus dañ gnas skabs de dag ñid gžan las khyad par du gyur pas khyad par te de dag tu ñes pa'i rdzas gcig dañ lhan cig tu spyi 'dres pa ste rdzas yul la sogs par ñes pa'i phyir 'dres pa yañ ñes pa yin no 'dres pa des rnam par ma bcad ciñ khyad par du ma byas pa'i rañ bžin gžan gañ yin pa des stoñ pa ste dben pa 'am yañ na de stoñ žiñ med pa ste de 'i phyir ro gtañ tshigs kyi don ni ñes pa'i rañ bžin gyis gsal ba dañ 'brel pa'i rañ bžin las rañ bžin gžan med pa'i phyir ro žes bya ba yin no
PVA _{Skt} 476,1–2	deśakālāvasthāviśeṣaniyataika(vyakti)-samsarga(sic)vyavacchinnaśabhāvāntaravirahād
PVA _T D131a4	yul dañ dus dañ gnas skabs kyi khyad par ñes pa gcig dañ 'dres pas rnam par ma bcad pa'i rañ bžin gžan gyis stoñ pa'i phyir žes bya ba
'Od zer 149a7	bsgrub bya ni yul lasogs pa'i khyad par can gyi gsal ba gžan dañ ldan pa ma yin te gsal ba du ma dañ ma 'brel ba bsgrub bya'o

rNam nes ṭi ka 81a1–2

rdzas spyi 1 po'i rnam par snañ pa ni chos
can yul dañ dus dañ rañ bzin gyis khyad par
du byas pa can gzan gsal ba du ma dañ ldan
pa ste 'brel pa ma yin te | rtags ni yul dañ
žes so || **gsal ba** ni gsal ba de dag go || 1 ni
spyi'o || yul dus 1 du 'dres pa ni 'brel pa'o ||

[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 santamase hastasañcāreṇa*. The term *sañcāra* is translated as *byugs* (*D byug*) *pa*; in the following sentence again, *de ltar byugs pa'i* renders *tathāsañcāriṇaḥ*. The same Tibetan term is also used in the PVinṬ and in Jñānaśrībhadrā's citation of this passage of the PVin.

According to the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (6114), the verb *byug* should be used to translate *upalepana* (“smearing, anointing”). *Sañcāra* conveys instead the idea of “walking through.” For *sañcārya*, the *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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 Jñānaśrībhadrā and rÑog 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 *añj*?). 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 *sañcāraḥkāraṇābhāvād* — *'pho ba'i rgyu ni med pa'i 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.

PVin _{Skt} 60,11–61,1	yathā santamase hastasañcāreṇa
PVin _T D206b6; P304b1	dper na mun khuñ du lag pa byugs (D byug) pa bzin no
“like by fumbling (with)/rubbing hands in the darkness [there arises the thought “there is no pot, etc.” even though one does not see something void of a pot].”	
PVin _T _{Skt} 86a2–3	yathā santamase santate tamasi hastasañcā- renāsty abhāvapratītir ghaṭādīnām [...] sañ- carato hastasyāntara ātmīyo viśiṣṭaḥ sparśa upalabhyate
PVin _T _T D89b5–6	dper na mun khuñ mun pa'i smag tu lag pa byugs pas bum pa la sogs pa med par rtogs pa yod pa bzin no ze na [...] byugs pa'i lag pa'i nañ gi bdag ñid kyi khyad par can gyi reg pa dmigs pas yin no
Jñ D257b4	mun par lag pas byug pa na zes bya ba ni mun pa'i sa phyogs na bum pas stoñ pa myoñ ba med de mi mthoñ ba'i phyir ro sñam du sems pa'o

[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 *nes par 'thob pa*. This expression is found in the Tibetan translation of Jñānaśrībhadrā'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 *niyatā prāptir asya* in the PVinT. This rendering does not necessitate postulating a distinct source text:

The rendering of *prāptiḥ* 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 *prāptiḥ* 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 *grahaṇaprāpter*), and this translation was later revised as 'gyur.

The rendering of *niyata* as *gdon mi za bar* is attested in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* and is an acceptable alternative to *nes par* as far as meaning is concerned. But one can note that elsewhere in PVin 3 rÑog Lo consistently uses *nes pa* whenever the expression *niyata* 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_T (D70b3 and D70b5) for *niyamena* (PVinT_{Skt} 67a2), an expression for which he uses *nes pas/nes par* elsewhere in the commentary.

We may suggest that a reason for rÑog Lo's choice of *gdon mi za bar* over *nes par* is a consequence of his choice of 'gyur to render *prāpti*. Indeed, the translation *nes 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.

PVin _{Skt} 4,11–12	tadabhyupagame 'paro niyataprāptir iti durnivārah
PVin _T D188b1; P286a8	de khas len na g'zan gdon mi za bar 'gyur ba'i phyir bzlog par dka'o

"When one has admitted that [impossible logical reason], the other [i.e. the impossible consequent] is **certainly arrived at**; therefore it is difficult to repress [i.e., to repress arriving at an impossible consequence from an incorrect logical reason]."

PVinT _{Skt} 8a2–3	tasmād <i>tasya</i> vyāpasyānekadeśasthatvasyābhy- upagame <i>paro</i> [read: 'paro] nānāvākhyo <i>niyatā</i> <i>prāptir</i> asyeti <i>nivārayitum</i> aśakyah
PVinT _T D8b6	de'i phyir khyab par bya ba yul du ma na gnas pa <i>de khas len na g'zan</i> du ma ñid de <i>gdon mi za bar</i> <i>'gyur ba'i phyir bzlog par</i> mi nus so
Jñ D230b4	gal te du ma la 'jug pa'i gcig po <i>de</i> mi ldog par <i>khas len na</i> de la khyab par byed pa tha dad pa <i>g'zan</i> de <i>nes par 'thob pa'i phyir</i> tha dad pa <i>dor</i> <i>bar dka'o</i>

[7] *aṅgāṅgitā* — *rtags dan' rtags can*

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 dan' yan lag can* (ñid). Instead, rÑog Lo renders the expression with the Tibetan *rtags dan' rtags can*. This is a calque translation of the Sanskrit *liṅgaliṅgiṅoḥ* (“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 dan' 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 dan' 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.

PVin _{Skt} 105,5–6	viśeṣaṃ punaḥ sādhyadharmināṃ kṛtvā sāmā- nyam hetuṃ bruvāṇasya dharmabhedād aṅgā- ṅgitā na virudhyate
-----------------------------	--

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 *kāryāṅgam* with *kāryalakṣaṇaṃ liṅgam*, also translated (as expected in this case) as 'bras bu'i mtshan ñid can gyi *rtags* (D196b2–3; P294b2).

PVin _T D219b4–5; P317b	khyad par bsgrub par bya ba'i chos can du byas te gtan tshigs su brjod pa la ni chos tha dad pa'i phyir rtags dañ rtags can mi 'gal lo ^a
“Further, for someone who states a generic [property] as the logical reason after having posited something specific as the subject of the thesis, ^b since [these] properties are different, it is not contradictory that they are ‘ member ’ and ‘ what has this member ’/logical reason and what has this logical reason.”	
PVin _T _{Skt} 124b8	gamyagamakabhāvo sty [read: 'sty] eva
PVin _T _T D139a3	go bya go byed kyi dños por 'gyur ba ñid do

^a The Tibetan in D and P omits translating *sāmānyam*. Jñ D278a1 cites the PVin in the form *gtan tshigs spyi'i chos*.

^b For instance, to posit “following effort” as the logical reason and “sound following effort” as the subject.

PVin _{Skt} 3.79ab (105,7)	bhedasāmānyayor dharmabhedād aṅgāṅgite- syate
PVin _T D219b5; P317b8	khyad par spyi chos tha dad phyir rtags dañ rtags can yin par 'dod
PV _{Skt} 4.186ab	bhedasāmānyayor dharmabhedād aṅgāṅgitā ta- taḥ
PV _T 4.186ab	des na bye brag spyi chos tha dad phyir rtags dañ rtags can ñid
PVin _T _{Skt} 124b8	<i>bhedasya sāmānyasya vāṅgāṅgitā</i> [em.: cāṅgā- ṅgitā]
PVin _T _T D139a3–4	<i>khyad par dañ spyi ni rtags dañ rtags can yin</i> te

[8] *ekānta* — *ñes pa ñid du*

As in the two previous cases, the translation *ñes pa ñid du yoñs su 'dzin pa* (adopted by Phya pa) is not a calque of the Sanskrit *ekānta-parigrahe*. While conveying the same meaning, *ñes pa ñid 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 *ñes pa* alone is frequent in Tibetan. It is illustrated, for instance, in the technical expression for inconclusive

logical reasons (*anaikāntika* — *ma ñes pa*). Besides, *ñes pa* also translates *niyata* and *niyama* (cf. [6]). Elsewhere in PVin and PVinṬ rÑog Lo adopts the translations *gcig tu ñes pa(r)* for *ekānta*.³⁶ This expression is a partial calque that conveys the meaning “certain/determined” while preserving the lexical equivalent of “*eka*” with “*gcig tu*.”

The rendering *ñes pa ñid du* is thus justified in view of the meaning of the text, as confirmed by Dharmottara’s commentary which glosses *ekāntaḥ* with *niyataḥ*.³⁷

Interestingly, in the translation of the PVinṬ one finds the Tibetan term *mtha’ gcig* as a gloss of the expression *ñes pa ñid du* cited from the PVin rather than the other way around. The same can be observed in a subsequent passage: *ekānta*^o in the expression *ekāntasādhanatvam* in PVin is rendered as *ñes 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* (PVin_{Skt} 46,3). This expression is translated *gcig tu ñes par* (D *pa*) *ldog pa’i phyir ro* (PVin_T D202b2; P300a2). This translation is adopted in ‘*Od zer* 175b2. Dharmakīrti explains the expression *ekāntavyāvṛtyā* (Tib. *gcig tu ñes pa ldog pas*). In his commentary, Dharmottara explains *ekānta* as *niścaya* (PVinṬ_{Skt} 66b7 *ekāntaniścayasya vyāvṛter abhāvāc ca*). The Tibetan keeps to the translation *gcig tu ñes pa* for *ekānta* and adopts *gdon mi za bar* for *niścaya*. See also PVin_{Skt} 59,10: *na cet, na kadācit kasyacit kiñcid ity ekānta eṣaḥ*, translated as ... ‘*i ni gcig tu ñes 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 niścayākhya nānyathā* (PVinṬ_{Skt} 10a1). This is translated: *gal te gtan tshigs grub na ñes par mtha’ gcig tu* ‘*dzin par* ‘*gyur gyi gzan du ni ma yin pas* | (PVinṬ_T D10b). On one occasion, the Tibetan does not translate the equivalence made between the two expressions by Dharmottara: PVinṬ_{Skt} 67b6, commenting on the expression *ekāntenānaikāntikaḥ*, says *ekāntena niścayanena*. Instead of translating this, the Tibetan states *ñes pa kho na ma ñes pa ñid ni ma yin no* || (PVinṬ_T D71b2).

the translation bears *ñes pa* for the word cited from the PVin and *mtha' 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 PVin_T along the following scenario: the translator first chose to translate *ekānta*^o as *ñes pa ñid du/ñes pa* in the PVin, possibly under the influence of Dharmottara's commentary glossing *ekānta*^o with *niyata/niścaya*. Turning to translate the PVin_T, he had to retain *ñes pa ñid du/ñes pa* 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 *ñes pa ñid du/ñes pa* glossed with *ñes pa ñid du/ñes pa*. rÑog Lo thus renders the gloss *niyata/niścaya* by resorting to the calque rendering of *ekānta*, the Tibetan *mtha' gcig*, even though this expression is not usually attested as a translation of *niyata* or *niścaya*.³⁹

PVin _{Skt} 5,8	ekānta pari grahe syād eṣa doṣaḥ
PVin _T D188b4; P286b4-5	ñes pa ñid du yoñs su 'dzin pa skyon 'dir 'gyur ba 'am
“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	ñes pa ñid du zes pa
PVin _T _{Skt} 9b1	ekānto <i>niyata</i> bhāvas tasya pari grahe
PVin _T _T D9b3	ñes pa ñid du zes bya ba ni <i>mtha' gcig gis</i> dños po ste ... der yoñs su 'dzin na ni

³⁸ Jñānaśrībhadrā 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 rÑog Lo translates the term *viraha* in the long compound *deśakālāvasthāviśeṣāniyataikadravyasaṃsargāvyavacchinnaśvabhāvāntaravirahād* (PVin_{Skt} 4,4–5) as *ston pa* (PVin_T D188a5–6, P286a5–6). When it comes to translate Dharmottara's gloss of *virahaḥ* as *sūnyatvaṃ* (PVin_T_T 6a5), rÑog Lo retains *ston pa* for the former expression and uses *dben pa* for the latter (PVin_T_T D7a1).

Jñ D231a2–3	<i>gcig tu nes par</i> gcig du ma la 'jug pa ñid du <i>yoñs su bzun nas</i> rtags ma grub pa'i <i>skyon 'dir</i> <i>'gyur gyi</i>
-------------	---

PVin-Skt 36,11–37,1	na ca pramāṇalakṣaṇavyatirikto 'nyo 'sti viśeṣaḥ pratyakṣasya ya ekāntasādhanatvaṃ (vari- ant: ekāntaṃ sādhanam) vyavasthāpayati
PVin _T D199a5–6; P297a3–4	gañ žig nes 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 val- id cognition that would posit it to be an exclusive means of establishment.”	
'Od zer 172b7	khyad par gžan mi ruñ ba ni <i>gañ žig nes par</i> žes pa ste
PVin _T _{Skt} 53b6	sa ekānte niścaya [em. niścayaṃ] <i>sādhanatvaṃ</i> <i>na vyavasthāpayati</i>
PVin _T _T D56b4	de ni nes par žes bya ba mtha' gcig tu <i>sgrub</i> <i>par byed pa ñid nram par 'jog pa ma yin no</i>
Jñ D248a2–3	gal te bye brag yod na ni bye brag des gcig ste mñon sum <i>grub par byed pa žes bya bar tshad</i> mar <i>nram par gžag la</i>

[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.

PVin _{Skt} 13,9–10	tato bāhyenārthenārthavattvam anīṣṭam syāt
PVin _T D191a5; P289a6	de'i phyir phyi rol gyi don dañ ldan pa ñid 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].”	
PVin _T _{Skt} 16a5	anīṣṭam avyutpattivādinaḥ sidhyati
PVin _T D17b3–4	bye brag tu bśad pa yin par smra ba mi 'dod pa 'grub par 'gyur ro
Jñ D234b4–5	'dir rañ gi ño bo tсам gyi don dañ ldan par sgrub par 'dod la rnam par dbye bas ni phyi rol gyi don gyis don dañ ldan par 'gyur ba'i phyir mi 'dod pa bsgrub pa'am

[10] *na — mi mtshuñs*

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 gzan la yan* [P 'ang] *mtshuñs 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 Jñānaśrībhadrā, as the Tibetan cites the PVin in the form *ma yin te*. But in the Tibetan canonical translation we find *mi mtshuñs 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 mtshuñs 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.

PVin _{Skt} 20,1	na, atra...
PVin _T D193a7; P291a8	mi mtshuñs te 'dir

'Od zer 160b1	<i>mi mtshuñs te</i> źes pa'o
PVinT _{Skt} 25a6	<i>na samānaṃ</i>
PVinT _T D27a4	<i>mi mtshuñs</i> te
Jñ D239a5	<i>ma yin te</i> źes bya ba ni nam mkha'i yon tan ni skabs ma yin pa ni ma yin pa'o

2. Syntactic variants

[1] Affirmative sentence — double negation

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.

PVin _{Skt} 129,9–10	tasmād bhinnadeśair yugapatsambandhaḥ sarvavyāpini sidhyati
PVin _T D227b4; P326b4–5	de'i phyir yul tha dad pa dag dañ (P om. dañ) cig car 'brel pa ni thams cad du khyab pa ma yin par mi 'grub po
“Therefore, the simultaneous relation with distinct loci is established for what pervades everything/is not established for what does not pervade everything.”	
PVin _T D170a6–7	gañ gi phyir de lta yin pa <i>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</i>

[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 Jñānaśrībhadrā, 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 prakāṣitaḥ*. Dharmottara explains this phrase as follows: “thus, what is posited as the subject is not established as a logical reason.”

PVin _{Skt} 100,7	tasmān na dharmī hetuḥ ubhayāsiddheḥ
PVin _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 zes bya ba ni rgol ba dañ phyir rgol ba gñi ga la yañ phyogs tha dad pa cuñ zad kyañ ma grub bas so

PVin _{Skt} 3.78cd (100,5)	sādhyaḥ sādhananatām nītas tenāsiddhaḥ prakāśitaḥ
PVin _T D218a2; P316a1	bsgrub bya de ñid sgrub byed du bźag pa des na ma grub bstan
PVin _T _{Skt} 120a4–5	asiddho hetutvenāyaṃ dharmmivyaḍi- ṣṭaḥ
PVin _T D133a3	chos can du bstan pa de ni gtan tshigs ñid du ma grub bo

[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 *zin*, or less neutral, for instance, by suggesting a causal relation. This is the case, for instance, in the translation of the sentence *vyastaḥ pramāṇābhyāṃ nirākṛto viparyaye pramāṇavr̥tter anāśrayaḥ 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” (*pramāṇābhyāṃ nirākṛto*), and *hetor anāśrayaḥ* is glossed as “not the basis for a counter valid cognition” (*anāśrayaḥ pratipramāṇasya*).

In the Tibetan translation — attested to be rÑog 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 pramāṇavr̥tter*). 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.

PVin _{Skt} 29,3–4	<i>vyastah</i> pramāṇābhyāṃ nirākṛto viparyaye pramāna- vr̥tter anāśrayaḥ pratipramāṇasya
PVin _T D196a7; P294a7	bsal (D gsal) ba ni tshad ma dag gis bzlog pa yin pas zla po'i tshad ma'i rten ma yin te bzlog pa la tshad ma žugs pa'i phyir ro “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.”
<i>dKa'</i> gnas 412,20– 413,1	<i>bsal pa ni</i> <i>zla bo'i tshad ma'i rten ma yin te</i> žes 'brel te <i>de'i gtan tshigs bzlog pa la tshad ma žugs pa'i</i> <i>phyir žes bya ba'o</i> <i>gtan tshigs gñis pa 'di ñid ma</i> <i>grub pa spoñ ba ni</i> <i>bsal ba ni tshad ma dag gis bzlog</i> <i>pa yin pas</i> žes sbyar pa ste <i>des na bzlog pa la tshad</i> <i>mar žugs par khas blañ ño</i>
'Od zer 166a5–8	<i>de'i rtags bsgrub pa ni bzlog pa la tshad ma žugs pa'i</i> <i>phyir žes pa'o</i> [...] des na rtags 'jug pa'i yul ma yin par dam 'cha' ba na'añ de ñañ rtags pa gcig pa'i <i>zla bo'i tshad ma'i rten ma yin</i> <i>te žes gsuñs pa yin no</i> [...] de sgrub pa'i rtags kyi rten ma yin pa ci ste že na <i>bzlog</i> <i>pa la tshad ma žugs pa'i phyir ro žes pas de sgrub po</i> bzlog pa la tshad ma žugs pa'i tshul ni <i>bsal pa ni žes</i> bya
PVin _{Skt} 39b3–5	kasmāt punar vyaste hetu [em. hetur] nocyate yato hetor anāśraya ity āha <i>vyastah pratipramāṇasya anā-</i> <i>śrayaḥ</i> kasmād anāśrayaḥ pratipramāṇasādhyasya vi- paryayo [em. <i>viparyaye</i>] viruddhe <i>pramāṇasya vyatteḥ</i> [em. <i>vr̥tteḥ</i>] yasya viruddhe pramāṇaṃ vr̥ttaṃ tad vyastam āśravaṇatvam iva nanu ca <i>viryaye pramāṇa-</i> <i>vr̥ttāv</i> api viruddhāvvyabhicāriṇo hetor āśrayo dṛṣṭa ity āha <i>pramāṇābhyāṃ nirākṛto vyasto nānyaḥ</i>
PVin _T D42a1	gañ gi phyir gtan tshigs kyi rten ma yin par 'gyur la bsal ba la c'i phyir gtan tshigs ma brjod ce na bśad pa <i>bsal ba ni zla bo'i tshad ma'i rten ma yin no</i> c'i phyir rten ma yin že na <i>zla bo'i tshad mas bsgrub</i> par bya ba las <i>bzlog pa 'gal ba la tshad ma žugs pa'i</i> <i>phyir ro</i> gañ gi phyir 'gal ba la tshad ma žugs pa can de ni bsal pa yin te mñan bya ma yin pa ñid bžin no

gal te bzlog pa la tshad ma žugs kyañ 'gal ba 'khrul pa
 med pa can gyi gtan tshigs kyi rten yin par mthoñ ba
 ma yin nam že na | bśad pa | *gsal ba ni tshad ma dag*
gis bzlog pa yin te | gžan ni ma yin 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.⁴⁰ But in the case of a source-based explanation, they simply reflect the reading of a variant Sanskrit source.

[1] *asato virahāt* — *med pa gžan dan bral ba'i phyir*

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

Dharmottara’s commentary bears the Sanskrit expression *itarasmād asato* (Tib. *med pa gžan*). In this context indeed, “inexistent” is an alternative to “existent.” This specification was made by Dharmakīrti in a previous passage.⁴¹ 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 PVin_{Skt} 1037-8: *tenetarāsadvirahēṇa tvayopagatatvād ity arthaḥ*; PVin_T D219a2; P317a4: *des na med pa gžan dan bral bar khyod kyi khas blañs 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 PVinT.

PVin _{Skt} 104,3	tathāpīdam asiddham evāsato virahād iti vyabhicāri vā
PVin _T D219a6; P317a8–b1	<i>de lta na yañ med pa gžan dañ bral ba'i phyir žes bya ba 'di ma grub pa ñid dam 'khrul par 'gyur ro </i>
“Thus also [from the point of view of the opponent], this [logical reason] “ devoid of inexistence/devoid of the alternative inexistence ” is just un-established, or it is deviant.”	
PVinT _{Skt} 123b2	<ta>thāpīdam asiddham itaras(m)ād asato virahād iti
PVinT _T D137a6	<i>de lta na yañ med pa gžan dañ bral ba'i phyir ro žes bya ba 'di ma grub pa ñid do </i>
Jñ D277a7–b1	<i>de las grol bas 'di rtags su brjod na yañ rtags des bsgrub par bya ba med pa thams cad sel bar byed de de lta na yañ rtags 'di bsgrub bar bya ba med pas stoñ pa žes bya bar 'gyur bas de ñid bsgrub par bya ba yin pa'i phyir rtags ma grub pa yin no yañ na 'khrul pa can yin no žes bya ba ni...</i>

[2] *dvasya* — *gtan tshigs gnyis 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 Jñānaśrībhadrā's commentary lack an equivalent. Here also, the addition of *gtan tshigs* in Tibetan is more likely to be an intruding gloss or a translation influenced by Dharmottara's commentary.

PVin _{Skt} 46,6	asya (variant: tasya) hi dvayasyaikatra samuccayāt...
PVin _T D202b4; P300a5	gtan tshigs gñis po 'di gcig la (D las) bsdus pas ni...
“Indeed, because of the grouping of these two/two logical reasons for one [too restricted property]...	

'Od zer 175b3	don bsdus ba ni gtan tshigs źes pas te
PVin _T _{Skt} 67a7	asya hetudvayasya yasmād <i>ekasmin*</i> dha(r)mme 'sādhāraṇe <i>samuccayāt*</i>
PVin _T _T D71a3	gañ gi phyir gtan tshigs gñis po 'di thun moñ ma yin pa'i chos gcig la <i>bsdus pas ni...</i>
Jñ D252b3	'di gñis gcig tu <i>bsdus pas</i> źes bya ba ni rtag pa dañ mi rtag pas bsdus pa dañ gcig tu nes pa log pa dag go

[3] *abhāvaniścayaḥ* — **bsgrub bya med pa las ldog par nes**

Another passage involves a longer addition: while the Sanskrit reads *abhāvaniścaya* (“determination of absence”) the Tibetan specifies *bsgrub bya med pa las ldog par nes* (“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/vyāvṛtti*) and of non-, opposite of (*-abhāva/-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 nes* translates *sādhavyatirekābhāvaniścayaḥ*. 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” (*sādhyaḥbhāvasaṃdehāt* — *bsgrub par bya ba med par the tshom za ba*).

PVin _{Skt} 101,11–102,1	tata (variant: tatra) eva katham abhāvaniścayaḥ
PVin _T D218b2–3; P316b3	ji ltar de ñid kyis (P ky) bsgrub bya med pa las (D la) ldog par nes
“For this reason precisely, how could there be determination of absence/of exclusion from what is not to be proven? ”	
PVin _T _{Skt} 121a6	tasmāt <i>tata eva</i> sādhyaḥbhāvasaṃdehāt <i>katham</i> sādhavyatirekābhāvaniścaya <ḥ>
PVin _T _T D134b2	de'i phyir <i>ci ltar</i> bsgrub par bya ba med par the tshom za ba <i>de ñid kyis</i> bsgrub par bya ba med pa las ldog par nes te

[4] Ø — *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 nānairātmyād ātmā jīvaccharīre sidhyati — de lta na yañ bdag med pa med pas gson po'i lus bdag dañ bcas par mi 'grub po* ||).

PVin _{Skt} 123,4–5	yenāyaṃ na vyatirekasyābhāvaṃ bhāvam ic-chati
PVin _T D225b3–4; P324b2	gañ gis na bdag med pa med pas bdag yod par 'gyur bas 'di ldog pa med pa dños 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. ”	
PVin _T D163a3	'di ltar bdag med pa bdag ldog pa med pas bdag yod par 'gyur ba rig pa can 'di ldog pa ste dños po med pa <i>med par dños por 'dod pa ni ma yin no</i>

[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 separate 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 **asaṃhata*, a reading supported by both Dharmottara's and Jñānaśrībhadrā's commentaries.

Jñānaśrībhadrā 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 *asaṃhata* or might have chosen it as the best reading in the same way the editors of PVin 3 did.

PVin _{Skt} 114,1–2	nanu samhatānām (variant: samghātānām) samhata ^o (editorial ementation: asaṃhata ^o)paropakāranīyamābhāvād anaikāntika evety aviruddhaḥ
PVin _T D222b1–2; P321a2–3	gal te 'dus pa rnam s 'dus pa ma yin pa (D par) gzan la phan 'dogs par nes pa med pa'i phyir ma nes pa yin pas (D om. ma nes pa ma yin pas) 'gal ba ma yin pa ma yin nam
	“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.”
PVin _T D151a2	'dus pa rnam s 'dus pa la ma yin pa'i gzan gañ yin pa de la phan 'dogs par byed pa ñid du ma nes pa'i phyir ro de'i phyir 'gal ba ma yin no
Jñ D280b1–2	gal te 'dus pa rnam s gzan 'dus pa ma yin pa la phan par zes bya ba ni 'dus pas 'dus pa ma yin pa'i don byed pa'o kha cig 'dus pa gzan rnam s gzan 'dus pa la phan pa zes 'don to

[6] *pratiśedhāt* — *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 rÑog 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 ñid*) 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).

The Tibetan translation of Jñānaśrībhadrā'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 rNog Lo.

PVin _{Skt} 67,6–7	tadarthapratīṣedhe dharmivācino 'prayogād abhidhānasya tasya pratiṣedhāt nirviṣayasya ca pratīṣedhasyāyogāt
PVin _T D208b4–5; P306a7	don de dgag pa la chos can brjod pa'i tshig sbyar ba med pa'i phyir te de ma bkag pa'i phyir yul med pa'i bkag pa mi ruñ ba'i phyir ro že na
“Opponent: Because when one negates this object [expressed by the word <i>pradhāna</i>] 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.”	
<i>dKa' gnas</i> 473,5–7	'o na de dgag byar 'gal bas dgag bya med la des na <i>yul med pa'i dgag pa mi ruñ no</i> zes brjod pa ni de ma bkag pa'i phyir zes bya ba'o
'Od zer 181b4–5	'o na de dgag byar 'gal bas dgag bya med la des na <i>yul myed pa'i dgag pa mi ruñ no</i> zes brjod pa ni de ma bkag pa'i phyir zes bya ba'o
Jñ D261a5	de bkag par mi 'gyur te zes 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 Jñānaśrībhadrā, 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.

PVin _{Skt} 12,8–9	tathā ca sarvo hetur viruddho dṛṣṭāntāś ca sādhyavikalah syāt
PVin _T D190b7–191a1; P288b8	de lta yin dañ (P yin na dang) gtan tshigs ’gal ba dañ dpe bsgrub (D sgrub) par bya bas (D byed pas) stoñ par ’gyur te
“And in such a case, every logical reason would be contradictory and [every] example would lack the probandum.”	
’Od zer 154b1–2	de lta na byas pa dañ rtsod byuñ lasogs pa phyogs dañ ldan yañ bzlog pas khyab pas na <i>gtan tshigs thams cad</i> ’gal ba dañ źes smos la chos de dag dpe’ bum pa la myed pas <i>dpe bsgrub byas stoñ par ’gyur ste</i> źes smos so

<i>rNam nes ṭi ka</i> 86a6–7	'dod na 'dod pa de <i>lta yin dañ</i> 'zes so thal ba ni byas pa lasogs pa'i <i>gtan tshigs</i> 'zes so dpe ni bum pa lasogs pa'i dpe thams cad do [...] rtags ni rtags thams cad 'gal ba yin pa dañ dpe thams cad bsgrub bya'i chos kyis stoñ ba <i>de'i phyir</i> 'zes so
PVin _T _{Skt} 15a7	<i>hetuḥ sarvvo</i> vaśyaṃ [read: 'vaśyaṃ] ka- syacid dharmmasya viparyayeṇa (vy)āp- tatvād <i>viruddhaḥ syād dṛṣṭāntaś ca</i> sar- vvaḥ <i>sādhyena vikalāḥ</i>
PVin _T _T D16b3–4	<i>gtan tshigs thams cad</i> 'gal bar 'gyur la dpe thams cad kyañ bsgrub par bya bas stoñ par 'gyur ro
Jñ D233b7	<i>de lta na gtan tshigs thams cad</i> 'gal <i>ñin</i> 'zes bya ba bdag gis khyab par byed pa dañ 'gal ba 'dren pa'i phyir ro

[2] *saivāvinābhāvaḥ* — ∅

The canonical Tibetan translation lacks an equivalent for the phrase *saivāvinābhāvaḥ* 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 PVin_T 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 ñid me na mi 'byuñ ba*, thereby starting with the same syllables as the next sentence *de ñid kyis ni rjes su 'gro ba grub pa'i phyir*.⁴²

PVin _{Skt} 117,7	saivāvinābhāvaḥ
PVin _T D223b5; P322a8	∅

⁴² A similar explanation was proposed for the omission of the phrase *lakṣa-
ṇaṃ/tallakṣaṇaṃ sarva/sarvatra pratīvirodhānāṃ* (PVin_{Skt} 38,8) in the Ti-
betan 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 D155b2

bdag la srog la sogs pa'i gnas pa de 'dra ba ni
bdag *med na mi 'byuñ 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’ (*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.”

not explicit in the source.⁴⁵ On this account, rÑog 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 rÑog 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 rÑog Lo and contributing to the translation process.

The observation of this phenomenon in the case of rÑog 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

⁴⁵ The specificity of rÑog 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 rÑog 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 rÑog 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.

Bibliography

Sources

Indian works

- Jñ Jñānaśrībhadrā, *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*, Tibetan translation in D4228, P5728.
- PV_{Skt} and PV_T Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇavārttika*, ed. by Y. Miyasaka in *Acta Indologica* 2, 1972.
- PVA_{Skt} Prajñākaragupta, *Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkāra*, ed. by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana in *Pramāṇavārtikabhāṣyam or Vārttikālaṅkāraṃ of Prajñākaragupta*, Patna, 1953: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- PVA_T Prajñākaragupta, *Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkāra*, Tibetan translation in D4221, P5719.
- PVin 1&2 Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, chap. 1 and 2, ed. by E. Steinkellner in *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ, Chapters 1 and 2*, Beijing-Vienna, 2007: China Tibetology Publishing House / Austrian Academy of Sciences Press (Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region No. 2).
- PVin 3, PVin_{Skt} Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, chap. 3, ed. by P. Hugon and T. Tomabeche in *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya, Chapter 3, Critically edited*, Beijing-Vienna, 2011: China Tibetology Publishing House-Austrian Academy of Sciences Press (Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region 8).
- PVin_T Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, Tibetan translation in D4211, P5710.
- PVin_T_{Skt} Dharmottara, *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*, copy of the manuscript (see the introduction to PVin 1&2 and PVin 3 for the details).
- PVin_T_T Dharmottara, *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*, Tibetan translation in D4227, P5727.
- PVSV_{Skt} Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti*, ed. by R. Gnoli in *The Pramāṇavārttikam of Dharmakīrti: The First Chapter with the Autocommentary*, Roma, 1960: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (Serie Orientale Roma 23).

PVSV_T Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti*, Tibetan translation in D4216, P5717.

Tibetan works

- dKa' gnas* rÑog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan śes rab, *Tshad ma rnam nes kyi dka' ba'i gnas rnam par bśad pa*, ed. by Sun Wenjing, Qinghai, 1994: Kruñ go'i bod kyi śes rig dpe skrun khañ. A = manuscript preserved at the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing, CPN no. 005153(1); B in *bKa' gdams gsuñ 'bum*, vol. 1, 420–705.
- bKa' gdams gsuñ 'bum* *bKa' gdams gsuñ 'bum phyogs sgrig theis dan po/ gñis pa/gsum pa*, ed. by dPal brtsegs bod yig dpe rñiñ žib 'jug khañ. Vols. 1–30, Chengdu, 2006; vols. 31–60, Chengdu, 2007; vols. 61–90, Chengdu, 2009: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khañ.
- bsDus don* Phya pa Chos kyi señ ge, *Tshad ma rnam par nes pa'i bsdus don*, in *bKa' gdams gsuñ 'bum*, vol. 8, 3–23.
- bsDus pa* gTsañ nag pa brTson 'grus señ ge, *Tshad ma rnam par nes pa'i ũi ka legs bśad bsdus pa*, Kyoto, 1989: Rinsen Book Co (Otani University Tibetan Works Series, Volume II).
- rNam nes ũi ka* Chu mig pa Señ ge dpal, [untitled commentary on the PVin], in *bKa' gdams gsuñ 'bum*, vol. 8, 11–307.
- '*Od zer* Phya pa Chos kyi señ ge, *Tshad ma rnam par nes pa'i 'grel bśad yi ge dan rigs pa'i gnad la 'jug pa'i śes rab kyi 'od zer*, in *bKa' gdams gsuñ 'bum*, vol. 8, 35–427.

Secondary literature

- Franco 1997 Eli Franco, “The Tibetan translations of the *Pramānavārttika* and the development of translation methods from Sanskrit to Tibetan,” in *Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995*, Ernst Steinkellner (gen. ed.), Vienna, 1997: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 277–288.
- Freschi 2015 Elisa Freschi, “The Reuse of Texts in Indian Philosophy: Introduction,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 43/2-3 (2015), Special Issue on the Reuse of Texts in Indian Philosophy, part 1, ed. by Elisa Freschi, 85-108.
- Harrison 1996 Paul Harrison, “A Brief History of the Tibetan bKa’gyur,” in *Tibetan Literature: Studies in Genre*, Cabezón and Jackson (eds.), Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion (Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism), Chapter 3, 72–95.
- Hugon 2009a Pascale Hugon, “Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge’s Synoptic Table of the *Pramānaviniścaya*,” in *Sanskrit Manuscripts in China. Proceedings of a panel at the 2008 Beijing Seminar on Tibetan Studies, October 13 to 17*, E. Steinkellner, D. Qing, H. Krasser (eds.), Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, 47–88.
- Hugon 2009b Pascale Hugon, “Table of Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge’s *Tshad ma rnam nges bsdus don*.” Version 1. 86 pages. http://ikga.oeaw.ac.at/Mat/hugon_table_version1_2009.pdf.
- Hugon 2014 Pascale Hugon, “Tracing the Early Developments of Tibetan Epistemological Categories in Rngog Blo Idan shes rab’s (1059–1109) Concise Guide to the *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*,” *Journal of Tibetology* 9 (2014): 194–234.
- Kramer 2007 Ralf Kramer, *The Great Tibetan Translator. Life and Works of rNgog Blo Idan shes rab (1059–1109)*, Munchen: Indus Verlag (Collectanea Himalayica 1).

- Krasser 2012 Helmut Krasser, “Bhāviveka, Dharmakīrti and Kumārila,” in *Devadattīyam : Johannes Bronkhorst felicitation volume*, F. Voegeli, V. Eltschinger, D. Feller, M.P. Candotti, B. Diaconescu, M. Kulkarni (eds.), Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, Frankfurt am Main, New York, Oxford, Vienna: Peter Lang Verlag (Worlds of South and Inner Asia 5), 535–594.
- Lasic 2006 Horst Lasic, “Fragments of *Pramāṇa* Texts Preserved in Tabo Monastery,” in *Text, Image and Song in Transdisciplinary Dialogue*, D. Klimburg-Salter, K. Tropper and Ch. Jahoda (eds.), Leiden: Brill, 63–77.
- Lasic 2007 Horst Lasic, “Placing the Tabo *tshad ma* Materials in the General Development of *tshad ma* Studies in Tibet, Part one: The study of the *Nyāyabindu*,” in *Pramāṇakīrtiḥ. Papers dedicated to Ernst Steinkellner on the occasion of his 70th birthday*, Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 70.1), 483–495.
- Sakai 2010 Masamichi Sakai, *Dharmottaras Erklärung von Dharmakīrtis kṣaṇikatvānumāna: Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā zu Pramāṇaviniścaya 2* vv. 53-55 mit Prosa, Ph.D. Dissertation at the University of Vienna (<http://othes.univie.ac.at/9623/>).
- Seyfort Ruegg 1992 David Seyfort Ruegg, “Some reflections on translating Buddhist philosophical texts from Sanskrit and Tibetan,” *Etudes Asiatiques* XLVI.1, 367–391.
- Steinkellner 1980 Ernst Steinkellner, “Some Sanskrit-Fragments of Jinendrabuddhi’s *Viśālāmalavatī*,” in *A Corpus of Indian Studies, Essays in Honour of Professor Gaurinath Sastri*, Calcutta, 96–105.
- Steinkellner 1988 Ernst Steinkellner, “Methodological Remarks on the Constitution of Sanskrit Texts From the Buddhist *Pramāṇa*-Tradition,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 32, 103–129.
- Tillemans 2000 Tom Tillemans, *Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇavārttika. An annotated translation of the fourth chapter (parārthānumāna)*. Vol. 1 (k. 1–148), Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- van der Kuijp 1989 Leonard van der Kuijp, “An Introduction to Gtsang-nag-pa’s *Tshad-ma rnam-par nges-pa’i ṭi-ka legs-bshad bsdus-pa. An Ancient Commentary on Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇaviniścaya*, Otani University Collection No.13971,” [Introduction to the edition of] *bsDus pa*, 1–39.
- van der Kuijp 1993 Leonard van der Kuijp, “Two Mongol Xylographs (*Hor Par Ma*) of the Tibetan Text of Sa skya Paṇḍita’s Work on Buddhist Logic and Epistemology,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 16.2, 279–298.
- van der Kuijp 1994 Leonard van der Kuijp, “On Some Early Tibetan Pramāṇavāda Texts of the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing,” *Journal of Buddhist and Tibetan Studies* 1, 1–30.
- van der Kuijp 2003 Leonard van der Kuijp, “A Treatise on Buddhist Epistemology and Logic Attributed to Klong chen Rab ’byams pa (1308–1364) and Its Place in Indo-Tibetan Intellectual History,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 31, 381–437.
- Vetter 1966 Tilmann Vetter (ed. and transl.), *Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ, I. Kapitel: Pratyakṣam*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.