

Pragmatic Translating

The Case of Pa tshab Nyi ma grags

Anne MacDonald

The translation projects of the two major disseminations of Buddhism into Tibet benefited substantially from collaborations with monastics and learned laymen from the kingdom of Kashmir, whose contributions to the unprecedented knowledge and textual transfer rivalled those of the famed *paṇḍitas* from the monastic universities on the Indian plains and of scholars from the Nepal Valley.¹ The initial propagation (*snga dar*) is especially known to have derived important impetus from Kashmiri *ācāryas* who dared the journey to Tibet in order to spread the Buddhist doctrine by guiding and participating in the translation of its works. Tibetan histories and colophons to translated works as well as catalogues of these works record among translators of the first dissemination who hailed from or were identified with Kashmir notably Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Sarvajñadeva, Surendrabodhi, Prajñāvarman and Dharmākara,² each of whom worked individually with Tibetan translators or

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Kurt Tropper and Prof. Dorji Wangchuk for their careful reading of the paper and for erudite and insightful suggestions. I am also indebted to Dr. Patrick Mc Allister for his meticulous editing. Research for this article was supported by the Austrian Science Foundation in the context of the FWF projects S9805-G08 and P23196-G15.

¹For information on collaborations between Tibetans and scholars from the Nepal Valley, see, e.g., Lo Bue 1997.

²Tāranātha records that the first three of this group travelled to Tibet, and Bu ston reports that Jinamitra, Dānaśīla and others “established the precepts,” i.e., transmitted the Vinaya, at bSam yas (cf. Skilling 1997b: 116 and 119). For textual references connecting Jinamitra and others with Kashmir, see especially Skilling 1997b: 116 (and n. 13), 119f., 125f., 133, and also Naudou 1968: 85f. (1980: 99f.). The *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* (Ishikawa 1990: 1) describes Jinamitra, Surendrabodhi, Śilendrabodhi, Dānaśīla and Bo-

collaborated with Tibetans and each other and/or other *paṇḍitas* to produce, for the most part, fine Tibetan renderings of a truly impressive number of Sanskrit works. Included in their prodigious output are the translations of the *Bhikṣu* and *Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣasūtras*,³ the *Lalitavistara*, the *Abhidharmakośakārikā* together with its *bhāṣya*, the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, the *Madhyāntavibhāga*, the *Kāśyapaparivartasūtra*, the *Mahāparinirvānasūtra*, the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra*, the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti*, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and the *Madhyamakālaṃkārikā* and its *pañjikā*.⁴ Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Surendrabodhi and others are also recorded as having participated in compiling and emending the *Mahāvvyutpatti* prior to its finalization in the early ninth century.⁵ The Buddhist traditions and textual knowledge they and other Kashmiri and Indian masters held were transmitted in the spiritual centres of Kashmir throughout the approximately century-long eclipse of the doctrine in Tibet following the collapse of the royal dynasty, eventually reaching scholar-practitioners such as the eminent layman Ratnavajra and his disciples and descendants, who would serve as lodestars for new generations of Tibetan scholars.

It was the fame and acclaim of the monastic centres in Kashmir that attracted the interest of Tibetan students and patrons of the Buddhist doctrine in the early years of what would become the second dissemination of the teachings. As in the initial period, erudite Kashmiri scholars were invited or came of their own accord to Tibet, but monastic traffic in

dhimitra as “*nyi ’og gi mkhan po*” (“preceptors of Nyi ’og”). As Skilling (1997b: 119f. and ns. 35 and 36) has noted, the area designated by Nyi ’og remains unclear; Abhidharma literature understands it to be external to Kashmir.

³Skilling (1997b: 116–119) writes that the colophons to the two *Prātimokṣasūtras* and nine other Vinaya works reveal that these translations were done by royal command; four Madhyamaka works (the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, the *Akutobhayā*, the *Prajñāpradīpa* and Avalokitavrata’s *ṭīkā* on the latter) are also recorded as having been executed at the order of the king.

⁴For a list of translations attributed to Jinamitra and others mentioned above, see Skilling 1997b: 148ff. Cf. also *ibid.*, 115, n. 9. A less complete list appears in Naudou 1968: 87–90 (1980: 101–105). Skilling (1997b: 125), comparing Jinamitra, to whom is attributed the translation of 203 works, with the great Chinese translator Xuanzang, concludes that he likely acted primarily in the function of a supervisor or consultant.

⁵See Ishikawa 1990: 1 (translation for this section of the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* in Snellgrove 1987: 442). The dates of Jinamitra, Surendrabodhi, etc., are unknown, although we do know that they were active in 814, the date of the Tanjur version of the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* (cf. Skilling 1997b: 140f.)

the opposite direction now intensified. The relative proximity of western Tibet to Kashmir's spiritual-intellectual centres drew Rin chen bzang po (958–1055) as a young man to travel there for training with — according to the biography by Rin chen bzang po's direct disciple Khyi thang pa — two other companions.⁶ In the years that followed, the Great Translator collaborated with numerous Kashmiri and Indian *paṇḍitas* for the sake of providing the Tibetan world with access to the Buddhist teachings.⁷ Approximately a century after Rin chen bzang po's trip to Kashmir, subsequent to taking part in the religious council at Tholing convened by King rTse lde of Gu ge⁸ that was attended by a host of religious teachers and translators from Tibet, Kashmir and India, seventeen-year-old rNgog Blo ldan shes rab (1059–1109)⁹ undertook the journey to Kashmir with five other translators.¹⁰ Ensnared in his new environs, rNgog turned to Parahitabhadrā and the non-Buddhist Bhavyarāja for instruction in logic and epistemology, and to scholars such as Sajjana and Tilakakalaśa for teachings in specific Mahāyāna traditions, later translating and revising a number of works with these and other native scholars.¹¹ The colophon to rNgog's translation of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* bears witness to his admi-

⁶Dan Martin (2008: 18), referring to discrepancies noted earlier by Samten Karmay, reports that Khyi thang pa (Gu ge Khyi thang pa dPal ye shes), writing in possibly 1060, states, in contradistinction to later biographies, that his master initially travelled to Kashmir with only two companions, and that a second trip was undertaken years later at Ye shes 'od's bidding. Fifteen persons accompanied Rin chen bzang po on the second trip, with two of the fifteen dying of fever. Mention of twenty-one children being sent to Kashmir by Ye shes 'od first occurs in bSod nams rtse mo's history of 1167. The Tibetan text of Khyi thang pa's biography appears in Tucci 1988: 103ff. For the possible route taken by Rin chen bzang po to Kashmir, cf. Tucci 1988: 60f. and Martin 2008: 20, n. 19.

⁷For Kashmiri scholars associated with Tibet and translation projects of the early part of the second dissemination, see Naudou 1968: 134ff. (1980: 162ff.). On Rin chen bzang po's Kashmiri collaborators, see, e.g., *ibid.*, 155–158 (1980: 190–195).

⁸Kramer (2007: 37) notes that the council had also been called by the king's uncle, the translator Zhi ba 'od, for the purpose of revising old translations and creating new ones. Kramer writes, "For certain reasons, i.e. unsatisfactory translations, this aim was not achieved to the assembly's (or King rTse lde's) content, and it was decided to send a group of translators abroad, enabling them in this way to study thoroughly Sanskrit and the relevant doctrines with the greatest savants of India and Kashmir."

⁹There is some uncertainty regarding rNgog's birth-date; see Kramer 2007: 32, n. 6.

¹⁰For the names of and references regarding his companions, see Kramer 2007: 38.

¹¹See *ibid.*, 39f. and Appendix 2 (124ff.)

ration of and respect for Bhavyarāja's learnedness: He praises his teacher and collaborator as "the crest-jewel of logicians of glorious Kashmir."¹²

The present translator of interest, namely, Pa tshab Nyi ma grags, like rNgog and numerous others involved in the second dissemination, must have been prompted by the renown of the intellectuals inhabiting Kashmir's monasteries and news of the Buddhist works amassed in them to undertake the journey there from his home district of 'Phan yul, north of Lhasa.¹³ Held to have been born the year Rin chen bzang po passed away, that is, in the wood-sheep year of 1055–1056,¹⁴ he may have arrived in Kashmir around the same time rNgog did, and remained in the country for twenty-three years, studying, translating and, we might assume, instructing other visiting Tibetans. Pa tshab is perhaps best known for his translation of Candrakīrti's *Prasannapadā* (henceforth *PsP*) and *Madhyamakāvātārabhāṣya* (henceforth *MABh*), slightly less known for his translation of a number of other works, the most familiar of which is probably Āryadeva's

¹² *dpal ldan kha che'i rigs pa pa'i // gtsug gi nor bu skal ldan ni //*; cf. Kramer 2007: 39, n. 38 and (for the entire colophon) p. 61f. Kramer (53ff.) provides the Tibetan of and abbreviated English summaries for the colophons of the works translated and revised by rNgog.

¹³ More specifically, he was "a native of the upper district of Upper and Lower sPa-tshab in 'Phan yul" (Roerich 1976: 341). Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana, in his Hindī travel report *Merī jīvan yātra* (Vol. 2, p. 254), reports that in 1934 he visited the village "Pāchab" while travelling through the Phempo Valley on his way north from Lhasa to search for Sanskrit manuscripts in Reting Monastery. He was told that this village was Pa tshab Nyi ma grags' birthplace, and was shown the "Translator's Monastery" situated on the side of a mountain, a short way from the village, and twelve miles from Nalendra. He records that a stūpa at the monastery was reputed to contain Pa tshab's body. At the time of his visit, 20–25 monks and nuns were residing in the monastery. I was provided with a German translation (prepared by Gautam Liu) of Sāṅkrtyāyana's 1934 travel report by Dr. Birgit Kellner.

¹⁴ See Roerich 1976: 69. Leonard van der Kuijp (1985: 4) surmises that the birth-date of 1055 must be too early, given that it is recorded that Lha rje Zla ba'i 'od zer wanted to accompany Pa tshab on a pilgrimage to India as late as 1136, when Pa tshab would have been 81; Glang lung pa's ordination request in 1140 would further require that Pa tshab was alive and well at age 85. Van der Kuijp is of the opinion that the dating of Pa tshab's birth to the wood-sheep year 1055–1056, which occurs only in Sum pa mKhan po's chronological tables, not in any earlier ones, was motivated by a wish to connect Pa tshab with Atiśa, i.e., to have him seen as the rebirth of Atiśa, who, according to van der Kuijp, died the same year and was viewed by some Tibetans as a rebirth of Candrakīrti (Atiśa died in a wood-horse year [Roerich 1976: 261], thus 1054–1055). Van der Kuijp therefore argues for a dating of ca. 1070–1145.

Catuhśatakakārikā (henceforth *CS*) and Candrakīrti's *ṭikā* on it (henceforth *CSṬ*).¹⁵ He also revised the ninth-century translation of Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (henceforth *MMK*) made by the *paṇḍita-lo tsā ba* team Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan, the same team's *Ratnāvalī* translation, an earlier version of Nāgārjuna's *Yuktiśaṣṭikākārikā* (henceforth *YŚ*),¹⁶ the *Madhyamakāvatāra* (henceforth *MA*) translation by Nag tsho Tshul khriims rgyal ba, and (at least according to the Blue Annals)¹⁷ two *bam pos* of the *Śūnyatāsaptatvṛtti* translation that Abhayākaragupta and sNur Dharma grags had executed at Nālandā.¹⁸

Details regarding the sojourns in Kashmir of the Tibetans who studied and translated there are extremely scant.¹⁹ Some basic information,

¹⁵Included among these other works is also Dharmottara's *Paralokasiddhi*, which Pa tshab translated with Bhavyarāja, mentioned above.

¹⁶Although Pa tshab is usually said to have translated the *YŚ*, a comparison of his version of the *kārikās* with those embedded in the *Yuktiśaṣṭikāvṛtti* (henceforth *YŚV*; translated during the first dissemination) reveals that Pa tshab's version is based on and merely aims to improve the earlier version. The colophon to the Canon's free-standing *YŚ* confirms this, stating only that it was revised and finalized by Pa tshab and Muditaśrī; cf. Scherrer-Schaub 1991: 18. While the Blue Annals has him translating the *PsP*, *MABh*, *CSṬ* and the *YŚV* (cf. Roerich 1976: 342; *Deb ther sngon po* 1984: 416), the Canonical version of the *YŚV* was translated by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Śīlendrabodhi and Ye shes sde (cf. Scherrer-Schaub 1991: 98). Chizuko Yoshimizu, however, adverts to the fact that the *YŚV* passages cited by 'Jam dbyangs bshad pa'i rdo rje in his *Tshig gsal ston thun gyi tshad ma'i rnam bsad* do not correspond with those of the Canonical version, adding that G. Nagao noticed similar dissonances as regards the *YŚV* during his work on the *Lam rim chen mo*. Referring to the Blue Annals' statement, she hypothesizes that the translator of the *YŚV* cited by Tsong kha pa and 'Jam dbyangs bshad pa may have been Pa tshab (see Yoshimizu 1996: 154, n. 229; for the *YŚV* citations and their variants, see *ibid.*, 153–160).

¹⁷Roerich 1976: 342. The colophon to the translation of the *Śūnyatāsaptatvṛtti* does not note a revision.

¹⁸On Pa tshab Nyi ma grags and the works translated by him, cf. Lang 1990: 132ff., Seyfort Ruegg 2000: 44ff., Vose 2009: 48ff., Naudou 1968: 172–174, 184–189 (1980: 212–216, 230–236), Roerich 1976: 341ff.

¹⁹It is perhaps interesting to note that according to 'Brom ston's account of Atiśa's travels, when Nag tsho Tshul khriims rgyal ba (born 1011) arrived as a young man at Vikramaśīla, another famous destination for Tibetan scholars and practitioners, the Tibetans there lived in residences based on their home regions. Hubert Decler (1997: 160) writes, "An interesting minor trait in the depiction—Nagtso's eyewitness account—of Vikramasīla's monastic university is the mention of 'the common house of the Tibetans,' showing that already in India (as later in Tibet) students were boarded in different houses according to their region of origin. By the eleventh century it was already an established

however, concerning the external circumstances of Pa tshab's working environment is provided by a few of the colophons to his Tibetan translations. Pa tshab states, for instance, in the colophon to his translation of the *PsP* that he was aided in the formidable task of rendering the *PsP*'s Sanskrit into Tibetan by the Kashmiri *paṇḍita* Mahāsumati, whom he expressly describes as a **mahātārkika* (*rtog ge chen po*); he collaborated with this same scholar to revise Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan's translation of the *MMK*.²⁰ Pa tshab names the *paṇḍita* with whom he worked on the *MABh* as Tilakakalaśa, the local scholar who also teamed up with rNgog to work on at least six translations and revisions.²¹ The colophons to the *PsP* and the *MABh* translations and to the *MMK* revision further relate that the locale in which Pa tshab and the *paṇḍitas* Mahāsumati and Tilakakalaśa pooled their considerable talent for the respective projects was the Ratnagupta monastery situated in Kashmir's "incomparable city" (Tib: *grong khyer dpe med*, **anupamapura*), quite possibly Śrīnagar.²² No reference is made to the date of the *PsP*'s translation in its colophon. The colophon to the Tibetan of the *MABh*, on the other hand, indicates that the translation was made during the reign of the Kashmiri king (*kha che'i rgyal po*) dpal

feature for students to study abroad at Buddhist monastic universities, ranging from Taxila (present-day Pakistan) to far-away Wu Tai Shan in China, where Nāropa sent a student to study with a tantric master."

²⁰The *MMK* colophon as found in the Peking and Derge editions of the Tanjur refer to Mahāsumati as Hasumati (P 22b1; D 19a5). 'Gos Lo tsā ba writes that the "thang sag pa-s" (i.e., scholars of the monastery established by Zhang Thang sag pa, a direct student of Pa tshab's) trace their Indian Madhyamaka lineage-line from Pa tshab over Mahāsumati, Parahitabhadra and the Kashmiri layman Ratnavajra (cf. Roerich 1976: 344; Lang 1990: 133f.). The Kashmiri scholar Parahitabhadra, with whom rNgog translated Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and *Nyāyabindu* and Dharmottara's *ṭīkā* on the former (Kramer 2007: 39f., Vose 2008: 48), was a student of Ratnavajra's, who Tāranātha claims had studied at Vikramaśīla (cf. Lang 1990: 133; Naudou 1968: 139ff. [1980: 168ff.]). The colophon to the *CŚT* informs us that Pa tshab translated this work together with Ratnavajra's great-grandson, Sūkṣmajana.

²¹See Kramer 2007: 40, 124. On Tilakakalaśa, see Naudou 1968: 185–187 (1980: 231–233).

²²The colophons to the Tibetan translations of the *CŚ* and *CŚT* also describe the city in which they were executed as *grong khyer dpe med*; the colophon to the *YŚ* revision does not mention a location. On variant names of the city and its identification with Śrīnagar, cf. Naudou 1968: 178–180 (1980: 208–210). The monastery's name in the *PsP* and *MABh* colophons reads *rin chen sbas pa'i gtsug lag khang* (*MMK* colophon: *gtsug lag khang rin chen sbas pa*); the *CŚT* colophon gives the place as *rin chen sbas pa'i kun dga'ra ba*.

'Phags pa lha, viz., *śrī Āryadeva.²³ The colophon attached to Pa tshab's revision of Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan's ninth-century translation of the *MMK* similarly states that the ruler (*mi'i bdag po*) at the time of the revision was *Āryadeva.²⁴ Given that there is no record of a Kashmiri king of this name in the eleventh or twelfth centuries, Jean Naudou identifies the king being referred to as Harṣa, the Kashmiri ruler who occupied the throne from 1089 to 1101, and hypothesizes that the *Ārya reflected in 'Phags pa may have resulted from a wrong pronunciation of Harṣa.²⁵ While Michael Witzel's investigations into the peculiarities of pre-fifteenth century Kashmiri pronunciation may lend some strength to Naudou's supposition,²⁶ it seems curious that Pa tshab would have been confused about the name of the ruler in whose domain he was residing. Supportive, however, of Naudou's conclusion that the colophons' appellation *Āryadeva indicates Harṣa is the direct mention of this historically attested throne-holder in Pa tshab's colophon to his and Bhavyarāja's translation of Dharmottara's *Paralokasiddhi*, where the ruler is designated as the Kashmiri king śrī Harṣadeva (*kha che'i rgyal po śrī ha ri śa de ba*).²⁷

Naudou's identification of the king with Harṣa is accepted by Karen Lang but she rejects his wrong-pronunciation theory, considering *Āryadeva of the *MABh* translation and *MMK* revision to be merely a title ("the

²³ *MABh*: *kha che'i rgyal po dpal 'phags pa lha'i sku ring la* (P 411a7; D 348a6).

²⁴ *MMK*: *mi'i bdag po 'phags pa lha'i sku ring la* (P 22b2; D 19a5). The colophons closing Pa tshab's translation of the *CŚT* and of his *YŚ* and *MA* revisions, like the colophon of the *PsP*, lack any reference to a date.

²⁵ Naudou (1968: 168, n. 1) states: "il s'agit certainement du même Harṣa, dont le nom a pu être rendu par 'Phags-pa lha, par suite d'une mauvaise prononciation (confusion entre Harṣa et Ārya)" (cf. 1980: 206, n. 12). On Harṣa, see Naudou 1968: 166–169 (1980: 204–208); Dutt 1985: 49.

²⁶ See Witzel 1994. The materials Witzel has examined for his study supply examples for the pronunciation of *a* as *ā* and of *ā* as *a*, as well as the regular Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA) change *r* plus consonant to double consonant (*r* + C > CC). Following this, the name Harṣa may have been pronounced Haṣṣa (the alternative form with *svarabhakti* and also *ṣ* changed to *ś*, i.e., Hariśa, is attested). Given that Witzel's material provides evidence for the pronunciation of *y* as *j* and *-ry-* as *-jj-*, the word Ārya may have been pronounced Ājja or Ajja. Whether any further changes that the development of Kashmiri as a New Indo-Aryan language had on pronunciation could have caused Harṣa and Ārya (i.e., Haṣṣa and Ājja/Ajja) to sound more alike is beyond my area of expertise.

²⁷ See Steinkellner 1986: 12, 31, 51. Hariśadeva reflects Kashmiri pronunciation; see FOOTNOTE 26.

noble king”),²⁸ an idea that would be more acceptable if *Āryadeva were not preceded in the colophons by, in the case of the *MABh*, “the Kashmiri king” and, in the case of the *MMK*, “the ruler of men.” I believe a more plausible explanation for the seeming problem would be that *Āryadeva was used as an alternative name for Harṣadeva.²⁹ Karen Lang infers from the fact that none of the colophons of works translated by Pa tshab refer to Harṣa’s successor Uccala that he must have left Kashmir to return to Tibet by 1101.³⁰

There is extremely little explicit information available concerning the internal circumstances of the Kashmiri working projects, in particular the ways in which the translator-teams proceeded in their tasks and the methods they employed. We are nonetheless able to ascertain that Pa tshab tended to follow a practice that can be determined to have been relied upon by certain other translators, that is, of utilizing previously translated root texts when translating Sanskrit commentaries that have their root text embedded in them; more precisely, Pa tshab did not translate the commentary’s citations of the root text but would instead locate an existing Tibetan translation of it and incorporate this as required into the translation of the commentary. It is not known when and/or where this mode of procedure originated: a prescription for such a practice does not appear in the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, the companion work to the *Mahāvvyutpatti* that enjoins proper translation methods and gives guidelines such as the retention of Sanskrit prefixes and word order. However, a much later, mid-eighteenth-century work, namely, the *Dag yig mkhas pa’i ’byung gnas* by lCang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje, which served as a Tibetan-Mongolian dictionary (comparable to the Sanskrit-Tibetan *Mahāvvyutpatti*) for scholars

²⁸Cf. Lang 1990: 140, n. 22.

²⁹This is further suggested by the fact that the element **deva* in the name *Āryadeva would also in this case identify the person designated as the current king. Was *Āryadeva possibly the name used by the Buddhist community to designate Harṣa? I do not intend to suggest a reason for its use, but the name would certainly conjure up a positive association with a famous Buddhist namesake. The city name Anupama(pura), mentioned by Pa tshab and other Buddhists, is also not recorded in any extant non-Buddhist works (there is, e.g., no mention of it or of the Ratnagupta monastery in any of the extant *Rājataranṅinīs* or in the inscriptions of the Palola Śāhis; my thanks to Prof. Walter Slaje for most generously checking the material for me). Prof. Slaje (personal communication), seeking to account for the differing designations for the city employed by its residents, sees in the name Anupama(pura) a socio-linguistic or religio-linguistic Buddhist usage.

³⁰Cf. Lang 1990: 134.

involved in the translation of the Tanjur into Mongolian, does expressly advocate reliance on pre-translated root texts. The last section of the preface to the list of Tibetan and Mongolian terms, a section dealing with translation principles, contains the regulations for translating Sanskrit commentaries that have embedded root texts.³¹ The Tibetan translates:

As regards commentaries on the major works: if the respective root text has already been translated, the words of the root [text] within the commentary should also be made to accord with that [translation]; if [a translation of the root text] does not exist, the root text should be translated first and should furthermore be translated in conformity with the commentary.³²

Thus the first part of the regulation, in calling for dependence on and the use of available Mongolian root texts, makes a further translation of root texts in commentaries redundant, while the second assures that a first translation of a root text reflects the interpretation of its commentator. Given the rarity of translation projects in the later centuries and thus the unlikelihood that the described way of working had been conceived solely for the Tibetan-Mongolian undertaking, it would seem justifiable to conclude that the prescription has been taken over from another, older work, or that this statement of the *Dag yig mkhas pa'i 'byung gnas* merely gives late written recognition to a mode of procedure relied upon and orally transmitted by earlier translators.

There is evidence that some of the translators active during the doctrine's early dissemination period had already turned to using pre-made Tibetan translations of root texts when translating commentaries on them. This method of dealing with embedded root texts no doubt spared them a great deal of time, but more importantly and ostensibly the reason behind

³¹Referring to this section in the preface, Seyfort Ruegg (1973:249) states that “the best known parallel” are “the principles of translation established for the benefit of the early Tibetan translators in the *sGra sbyor bam gñis*.” He adds (n. 25) that “[t]he *Dag yig mkhas pa'i 'byun gnas* is based in part on it and paraphrases several of its sections.”

³²Tibetan in Seyfort Ruegg 1973:260: *gzhung chen mo'i 'grel pa rnam la rang rang gi rtsa ba'i dpe sngar bsgyur zin pa yod na 'grel pa'i nang gi rtsa ba'i tshig kyang de dang mthun par bya la / med na sngon du rtsa ba'i dpe bsgyur zhing de yang 'grel pa la bstun nas bsgyur bar bya'o //*. Seyfort Ruegg (1973:253f.) translates the sentence beginning with *med na* as “otherwise, the translation [of the commentary] is to be made after the basic book has been translated and fitted in the commentary.”

the practice, it had the advantage of providing the Tibetan rendition of the root text—regardless of the commentary in which it was cited—with a desired consistency. Cristina Scherrer-Schaub, making reference to the *Dag yig mkhas pa'i 'byung gnas*'s above-mentioned prescription, confirms that a Tibetan version of the *YṢ* that had been made prior to the translation of the *YṢV* was used by the team Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Śīlendrabodhi and Ye shes sde when they rendered the *YṢV* into Tibetan.³³ Akira Saito has been able to ascertain that Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan's *modus operandi* for translating the *MMK* as the fundamental root text within the *Akutobhayā*, Buddhapālita's *MMK* commentary, Bhāviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa* and Avalokitavrata's *Prajñāpradīpatīkā* was initially to translate the *MMK* verses following the interpretation given by Avalokitavrata to Bhāviveka's comments on them (which would, as Saito states, appear to imply that they first translated the *Prajñāpradīpatīkā*, which contains the entire *Prajñāpradīpa* together with the *MMK*) and then to use this Bhāviveka–Avalokitavrata-coloured translation of the *MMK* for the other commentaries as they translated them; this same translation of the root verses was further used as the stand-alone Tibetan version of the *MMK*.³⁴ This employment of translated root verses tinged with the understandings of specific commentators quite naturally, however, has the potential to cause problems when the commentator into whose (translated) work they have been inserted has interpreted the words or content of a verse differently than the commentator(s) who influenced the Tibetan rendering of the root text: Saito counts twelve *MMK* verses embedded in the translations of the *Akutobhayā*, Buddhapālita's *MMK* commentary and the *Prajñāpradīpa* which are not in harmony with the explanation given by one or more of the respective authors of these three commentaries, but which in each case do accord with the explanation given by Avalokitavrata.³⁵ Scherrer-Schaub alludes to disconcerting initial encounters with verses of the *YṢ* that are in dissonance with Candrakīrti's interpretative

³³Scherrer-Schaub (1991: xxv, see also p. 3) remarks that the Dunhuang version of the *YṢ* resembles the version that was used within the translation of the *YṢV*. Cf. also Scherrer-Schaub 1999: 23 and Plate X where Dunhuang and Tabo manuscripts are shown with text—generally root text, she states—written on lines with large intervals between them; she interprets the manuscripts as awaiting the commentary to the root text.

³⁴Cf. Saito 1984: xvii–xviii and 1995: 91f., 95.

³⁵Cf. Saito 1995: 92.

statements on them during her editorial work on the *YŠV*.³⁶ The extent to which the insertion of already translated root texts into commentaries was practised in the early period of the propagation of Buddhism in Tibet is, however, still unknown, and needs to be investigated.³⁷

It can probably be concluded that Pa tshab Nyi ma grags was aware that some of his predecessors from the early dissemination, like Klu'i rgyal mtshan and Ye shes sde, had employed the root-text insertion method. Possibly even following their example, he did not undertake to translate the *MMK* embedded in the *PsP* when he translated the latter work but rather imported Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan's ninth-century rendition of this foundational Madhyamaka work, and merely tweaked certain verses here and there, in some instances to bring them into accord with Candrakīrti's interpretation of the *MMK* and in others to replace individual words with his own preferred terminology, occasionally rewriting phrases and/or revising word-order (to speak of Pa tshab's "translation" of the *MMK*, as many modern scholars tend to do, is an exaggeration).³⁸

As Saito's and Scherrer-Schaub's investigative work shows, while information about specific translational techniques can be very valuable and even time-saving for modern editors, translators and researchers, it is often discovered only after considerable toil with the textual material; except for the limited guidelines given in the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* and the much later *Dag yig mkhas pa'i 'byung gnas*, there is little external to the translations themselves to rely on. Commenting on the lack of explicit information on theory and methods in the main available translation manuals, Seyfort Ruegg writes:

³⁶Referring to the use of pre-made root text translations, Scherrer-Schaub (1999: 23) writes, "One may easily imagine what a nuisance this may be for a philologist and we were ourselves faced with this somehow puzzling problem in editing the Tibetan version of the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti* of Candrakīrti."

³⁷Also requiring investigation is the extent to which later editors interfered with inserted root texts or were themselves responsible for insertion. A number of words and phrases in *MMK* verses in the Derge edition of the Tibetan translation of Buddhapālita's *MMK* commentary have been modified to accord with those of the corresponding verses of the *MMK* in the translated *PsP*; compare, e.g., the Peking and Derge editions of Buddhapālita's commentary for *MMK* 2.24, 3.6, 10.1, 11.8, 17.25, 20.22 and 23.11.

³⁸Pa tshab expressly states in the colophon to the stand-alone *MMK* translation that he revised the earlier translation to accord with the *PsP* (cf. P 22b2, D 19a6). See Saito's comments on *MMK* 2.2 and *MMK* 7.16ab for cases where the changes required for concordance between the respective *kārikā* and Candrakīrti's comments were not correctly implemented by Pa tshab (1995: 88–90, 92–94).

Given then the importance to the Tibetans of translation and its attendant philological and methodological problems, and in view of the very considerable success they achieved in overcoming them, it is remarkable that the statements on the subject made in the *sGra sbyor* as well as in the *Dag yig mkhas pa'i 'byuñ gnas* are not only brief but even somewhat sketchy in their definition of the problems and their solutions. Though their results clearly show that the translators into Tibetan were by no means unaware of the philological and cultural problems involved, they did not submit them to an extensive theoretical treatment in these two works. The *Dag yig mkhas pa'i 'byuñ gnas* indeed itself states that it has given only a summary of the principles of translation and the associated philological problems.

... from the points of view of philology and the techniques of translation the statements of the *Dag yig* are hardly more advanced than those of the *sGra sbyor*. The principles followed, more or less reflectively, by the translators of the Buddhist canon into Tibetan have therefore to be elicited mainly from the study of the translations themselves, for as far as can be judged the approach of the translators was more practical than theoretical and conceptualized.³⁹

It has been interesting to discover that additional information regarding an aspect of Pa tshab's and seemingly other translators' methodology has been set forth quite explicitly and rather unexpectedly at the end of two of Pa tshab's translations. In a verse appearing in the respective colophons to his translations of the *PsP* and *MABh* (henceforth *PsP_{Tib}* and *MABh_{Tib}*), he first informs his readers how he as a translator dealt with his material and then provides advice for future translators. In speaking of himself, his purpose is to divulge his mode of operation as regards material quoted by Candrakīrti. With the verse in *PsP_{Tib}*'s colophon, he discloses that he did not restrict the textual importation practice to the root text being commented upon, i.e., the *MMK*, but took it a step further, applying it to citations *in general* within Candrakīrti's commentary. This information regarding his manner of dealing with the cited material is imparted in the first line of the verse, which is found at the end of *PsP_{Tib}*'s colophon. The verse reads:

³⁹Seyfort Ruegg 1973: 257–258.

*khungs rnams ji ltar grags bzhin bris*⁴⁰ //
phyin chad skad gnyis 'byung srid na //
'grel pa sgra don bzhin bsgyur la //
gzu bor byos la dpyad par rigs //⁴¹

The sources (i.e., citations) have been written as they are known.

If in the future translators happen to appear

They should translate commentaries according to the word and meaning,

And it is appropriate that they scrutinize/check [their translations] without being biased.

The verse appears in a slightly modified form at the beginning of Pa tshab's colophon to *MABh*_{Tib}. There it reads:

*khungs rnams phal cher mdo bzhin bris*⁴² //
*phyin chad skad gnyis 'byung*⁴³ *srid na* //
*rtsa 'grel sgra don bzhin bsgyur*⁴⁴ *la* //
gzu por byos la dpyad par gyis //⁴⁵

The sources (i.e., citations) were for the most part written in conformity with the *sūtras*.

If in the future translators happen to appear

They should translate root texts and commentaries according to the word and meaning,

And be unbiased and scrutinize/check [their translations].

With both versions of the first line, Pa tshab refers to the fact that he did not make it a practice to translate material that was being quoted by Candrakīrti, but instead relied wherever possible on the existing Tibetan

⁴⁰D: *pris*

⁴¹Cf. *PsP*_{Tib} P 225b6; D 200b7. P reverses *pādas* b and c. I am assuming, at least until proven wrong, that we are dealing with authentic author colophons in the case of the *PsP* and *MABh* translations, and that the verse discussed (the variants within it aside) is inherent to the colophon and not a later addition. I am grateful to Dr. Orna Almogi for her assessment of the authenticity of the colophon.

⁴²D: *pris*

⁴³P: *byung*

⁴⁴P: *skyur*

⁴⁵Cf. *MABh*_{Tib} P 411a6; D 348a5. The final *pāda* could alternatively be read as intending: "And they should do this in an unbiased and analytical manner."

translations of the works cited, using the ready-made translations for the relevant passages in *PsP*_{Tib} and *MABh*_{Tib}. One notes that it is only in the *MABh*_{Tib} colophon that Pa tshab refers explicitly, and exclusively, to the cited material as deriving from the (translated) *sūtras*. In the *PsP*_{Tib} colophon, he does not specify the literary genre from which the quoted material has been drawn. While it is possible that the *PsP*_{Tib} formulation was an arbitrary one, Pa tshab may have foregone characterization of the type of literature because he intended inclusion of works beyond the *sūtra* genre, such as scholastic treatises, i.e., *śāstras*. My comparison of the Sanskrit *śāstra* citations in the first chapter of the *PsP* with their *PsP*_{Tib} versions—for the sake of checking consistency between the Sanskrit and Tibetan—and of the latter, that is, of the *PsP*_{Tib} versions with the cited passages as found in the corresponding translated *śāstra* source texts, revealed that the vast majority of the *PsP*_{Tib} *śāstra* citations had indeed been appropriated from the corresponding *śāstra* translations.⁴⁶ It is possible that the mention of only *sūtras* in the *MABh*_{Tib} colophon verse warrants the deduction that Pa tshab was purposely excluding a reference to *śāstras* because he translated all the *śāstra* citations directly from the Sanskrit of his *MABh* manuscript, but at this point in time this cannot be confirmed. Fortunately, the editorial work being undertaken in Vienna on a newly available Sanskrit manuscript of the *MABh* will eventually provide a Sanskrit text on the basis of which the correspondence of the individual Sanskrit citations with their *MABh*_{Tib} versions can be checked.⁴⁷

One wonders if Pa tshab might have inherited this more encompassing conception of the insertion technique directly from translators trained by Rin chen bzang po, his predecessor in the second propagation who also studied and worked in Kashmiri monasteries and who appears to have either regularly or occasionally employed the importation method for dealing with *sūtra* citations. Paul Harrison's engagement with the *Drumakinnararājaparipṛcchāsūtra* has revealed that when Rin chen bzang po encountered the three citations of this work in Āryadeva's *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* during his translation of the latter, he appropriated their

⁴⁶I referred to this phenomenon in an earlier article when discussing a *śāstra* citation that Candrakīrti intentionally changed when he imported it into the *PsP*; cf. MacDonald 2003: 163.

⁴⁷The *MABh* manuscript is being edited under an agreement between the China Tibetology Research Center, Beijing, and the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia of the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

ready-made Tibetan versions from dPal gyi lhun po and dPal brtsegs' early dissemination translation of the *Drumakinnararājaparipṛcchāsūtra* and copied them into his *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* translation.⁴⁸ Peter Skilling has further been able to ascertain, upon examining a section of the translation of the *Abhiṅśkramaṇasūtra* attributed to Dharmasribhadra and Rin chen bzang po, that at least this section has been taken over word for word from the corresponding sections of the *Saṅghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya, which was translated in the initial propagation period by Sarvajñadeva, Vidyākaraprabha, Dharmākara and dPal gyi lhun po.⁴⁹

Like the reason behind the *Dag yig mkhas pa'i 'byung gnas*'s regulation that pre-translated root texts be utilized for the translation of commentaries, the motivation for copying in all cited material from previously existing Tibetan translations would surely have been to maintain consistency in quoting and to avoid disparities vis-à-vis the source-text translations. Of course, the extension of the translator's reliance on material external to the work at hand from the root text to *all* cited material (or as much as possible) is bound on occasion, if the translator is not cautious (as Saito and Scherrer-Schaub have shown for the use of pre-made root-text translations), to cause problems and inconsistencies. A problem resulting from the importation of scriptural material encountered by Christian Wedemeyer in the course of his analysis of Rin chen bzang po's translation of Āryadeva's *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* instantiates what can go wrong when pre-translated *sūtra* material is copied in without further reflection: a verse from the *Guhyasamājottaratantra* introduced by Āryadeva into the Sanskrit text of the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* for the sake of substantiating his discussion of the subtle mind's "eighty prototypes" was not translated by Rin chen bzang po but instead "pasted in," so to speak, from Rin chen bzang po's earlier translation of the *Guhyasamājottaratantra*, without the awareness that this translation of the verse did not contain, unlike its Sanskrit version, a reference to the number "eighty," which, as espied by Wedemeyer, turned the entire *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* passage into a *non sequitur*.⁵⁰

⁴⁸Harrison 1992: xlv–xlv. Harrison (xlv) notes, "That this must have happened before the compilation of the Tanjur is indicated by the fact that the wording of the *CMP* agrees with no known Kanjur version of the *DKP*"

⁴⁹Skilling 1997b: 131–132 and 1997a: 96. The translation of the *Saṅghabhedavastu* was revised by Vidyākaraprabha and dPal brtsegs.

⁵⁰Cf. Wedemeyer 2006: 166f.

In order to check the validity of Pa tshab's versified statement regarding his method of dealing with citations as he translated the *PsP*, I compared not only all of the *śāstra* citations, but, whenever possible, each cited *sūtra* translation in the first chapter of *PsP*_{Tib} (the first chapter makes up approximately one-sixth of the *PsP*) with the corresponding Tibetan translation of the cited material in the source texts, and additionally compared each of the *sūtra* citations in *PsP*_{Tib} against the Sanskrit of my edition of the first chapter of the *PsP*,⁵¹ which is based on de La Vallée Poussin's edition of the *PsP* (henceforth *PsP*_L) and manuscript readings. My initial findings revealed that 1) the cited *sūtra* material in *PsP*_{Tib} has clearly not been directly translated from the *PsP* Sanskrit and 2) the majority of the *sūtra* citations in *PsP*_{Tib} match up quite well with the corresponding passages in their source texts as contained in the Peking and Derge editions of the Kanjur. A couple of the translated citations stood out, however, because they lacked an exact correspondence in the Sanskrit and could also not be found in the form that they appear in *PsP*_{Tib} in the Peking or Derge source texts. For example, *PsP*_{Tib}'s first-chapter citation from the *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* (*Phags pa rdo rje 'i snying po*)⁵² lacks a corresponding translation for a number of words attested in the Sanskrit of the *PsP* and contains wrong translations for a few others,⁵³ from which it can reasonably be concluded, given our awareness of Pa tshab's skill as a translator and his efforts to mirror the words and syntax of the original text, that this *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* citation was not directly translated from *PsP*'s Sanskrit,⁵⁴ *PsP*_{Tib} appears to further support this conclusion

⁵¹Forthcoming.

⁵²The citation can be found in *PsP*_{Tib} at P 18a5–20a2 and D 16b2–18a3. The Sanskrit text of the citation takes up approximately three pages in *PsP*_L (cf. *PsP*_L 50–53).

⁵³For instance, *PsP*_{Tib} lacks a translation for *saṃtāpo* of *cāgnisaṃtāpo* (*PsP*_L 50.8), *viparyāsa* of *asadviparyāsamohitasya* (*PsP*_L 50.9), *sarva* of *sarvabālaprthagjanā* (*PsP*_L 51.3–4), and does not have an equivalent for *me uttari* (*PsP*_L 51.13). Additionally, *asat* of *asadviparyāsamohitasya* (*PsP*_L 50.9), *antareṇa* (*PsP*_L 50.10), *pauruṣa* of *anekapauruṣāyām* (*PsP*_L 51.8), *samānah* (*PsP*_L 51.10, and again *samāno* at 52.9) have not been understood correctly and thus are wrongly translated. Among other inconsistencies, *abhūtam*, (em. A. M.; see *PsP*_L 52.3 and n. 1) has not been translated and *imām* (*PsP*_L 53.2) has been incorrectly translated (possibly due to reading or having been read as *evam* in the manuscript from which it was translated).

⁵⁴While it is possible that the *PsP* manuscript(s) relied on by Pa tshab attested readings for the citation which were different from those of the manuscripts available to me, i.e., readings that would confirm that *PsP*_{Tib} had been translated from the Sanskrit of the *PsP*,

in that it presents a few words not found in *PsP* Sanskrit.⁵⁵ A comparison of *PsP*_{Tib}'s version of the citation with the corresponding passages in the *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* translation in the Peking and Derge editions reveals that it often diverges substantially from the said passages.⁵⁶ In an effort to find out if any other canonical collections might preserve a version of the *sūtra* closer to that imported into *PsP*_{Tib}, I compared, in reliance on material available from and collected by Vienna's "Tibetan Manuscripts" project, *PsP*_{Tib}'s citation of the *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* with the corresponding passages of the *sūtra* in the sTog Kanjur, in the Gondhla collection and in the Phug brag collection, but was unable to turn up a perfect match.⁵⁷ Immediately evident, however, was the fact that the *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* of the sTog Kanjur, the Gondhla collection and of one of the two manuscript copies of the *sūtra* in the Phug brag collection (henceforth Phug brag 1) is descended from the same translation, with various minor editorial and scribal variants, as that in the Peking and Derge editions. The translation in the second Phug brag manuscript of the *sūtra* (Phug brag 2) contains many different readings, and may be an independent translation, unrelated to the translation in the other collections, although this remains to be confirmed conclusively.

the nature of some of the mistakes in *PsP*_{Tib} (see main text below) make it doubtful that the discrepancies between the *PsP*'s Sanskrit and Tibetan can be explained away as merely owing to differences in Sanskrit manuscripts.

⁵⁵The occasional *yangs* which lack corresponding *apis* or *cas* could easily have been added to the Tibetan for the sake of clarity, but the possible translation for an extra non-attested **sa tatra* in *PsP*_{Tib}'s rendering of the Sanskrit sentence *sa tatra mānasam paridāham samjāniyād uttraset ...* (*PsP*_L 51.9) as *des de na yid kyi yongs su gdung ba myong bar 'gyur / de de na skrag par 'gyur / ...*, and, for example, the translation *phyin ci log gis bsgrubs pa* for *viṭhapitāḥ* (*PsP*_L 52.14; note that °*viparyāsaviṭhapitāḥ* at *PsP*_L 51.1 is translated as *phyin ci log gis bsgrubs*) seem to additionally support the conclusion that the Tibetan derives from a text of the *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* other than *PsP* Sanskrit.

⁵⁶For the *sūtra*, see P 807 (vol. 32, 300b3–312a4); D 139 (vol. 56, 278a1–289b4). The cited text can be found at P 304b8–305a3 and 306b6–308a4.

⁵⁷The "Tibetan Manuscripts" project is a sub-project of the National Research Network (NFN) "Cultural History of the Western Himalaya from the 8th Century." I am grateful to Bruno Lainé for providing me with scans of the *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* translation as preserved in the sTog Kanjur and in the Gondhla and Phug brag collections (see the article by Helmut Tauscher, CHAPTER 12 in the present volume); the four folios of the *sūtra* preserved in the Tabo Kanjur collection do not contain the section quoted in *PsP*_{Tib}. Mr. Lainé has informed me that the work is not contained in the Hemis collection and has not been found in the Basgo collection, though at the time of writing of the present article, the texts in the Basgo collection are still being sorted and identified.

The frequent similarity in phraseology and syntax of the *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* passages in *PsP_{Tib}*, however, with the corresponding sTog, Gondhla, Phug brag 1, Peking and Derge passages made it apparent that the *PsP_{Tib}* citation had neither been translated from scratch by Pa tshab nor derived from a completely different translation of the *sūtra*.⁵⁸ Closer examination revealed that the citation in *PsP_{Tib}* appears to have been imported from an earlier version of the translation of the *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* than that found in the sTog, etc., collections, that is, from a version that was later corrected and heavily revised, and eventually incorporated into the other canonical collections taken into consideration for the present study. We observe in the passages of the revised version of the *sūtra* that can be compared with their older forms as attested in *PsP_{Tib}*'s citation that many words have been replaced, sentences have been reworked, restructured or rewritten, and that, importantly, the gross mistakes which mar some of the sentences of the earlier rendition have been corrected. For instance, in the section of the citation in which the experience of a man who dreamed he went to hell is related, *PsP_{Tib}*'s version of the *sūtra* presents a wrong understanding of the word *pauruṣa* as “people” in the compound *anekapauruṣāyām*. The relevant Sanskrit sentence reads: *sa tatra kvathitāyāṃ saṃprajvalitāyāṃ anekapauruṣāyāṃ lohakumbhyāṃ prakṣiptam ātmanam saṃjānīyāt*.⁵⁹ The translator(s) of the version of the *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* that was relied on for *PsP_{Tib}* interpreted the sentence to mean that the man dreaming about hell imagined that he was thrown into a boiling, blazing iron pot *with many people* in it (*skyes bu du ma dang ldan pa*); *PsP_{Tib}* reads for the entire sentence: *des de na lcags kyi bum pa skyes bu du ma dang ldan pa khol ba 'bar bar bdag nyid bcug par yang 'du shes par 'gyur ro*.⁶⁰ This erroneous interpretation of the compound *anekapauruṣāyām* has been corrected, in accord with the Sanskrit, in the version of the *sūtra* found in the other collections to mean that the man

⁵⁸One also notes that the lack of a translation for *saṃtāpo* of *cāgnisaṃtāpo* (*PsP_L* 50.8), *viparyāsa* of *asadviparyāsamohitasya* (*PsP_L* 50.9) and *sarva* of *sarvabālaprthagjanā* (*PsP_L* 51.3–4) referred to earlier for *PsP_{Tib}* (see n. 54) likewise occurs in the *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* as contained in Peking, Derge and sTog, as well as in the Gondhla and Phug brag collections.

⁵⁹Cf. *PsP_L* 51.7–8.

⁶⁰Cf. *PsP_{Tib}* P 18b7–8. Phug brag 2 attests a similar mistake: *de der mi du mas lcags zangs su bcug nas ... 'tshal te ...*, although *mi du mas* appears to indicate the agent (“There, he imagined that he was thrown into an iron cauldron by many people ...”)

was thrown into a pot of many fathoms (*'dom du ma mchis pa*), i.e., one many fathoms high/deep (*Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī*_{Tib}: *de de na lcags kyi bum pa rab tu khol ba / shin tu 'bar ba 'dom du ma mchis pa'i nang na / bdag bcug nas ...*).⁶¹ Similarly, the word *samānaḥ* in the phrase *sa tatra prativibuddhaḥ samānaḥ*⁶² which is intended not in its classical meaning but rather in its Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit sense of “upon” (thus “Then he, upon awakening”), has been corrected in the version of the *sūtra* found in sTog, etc., so that the Tibetan phrase means “he, again awake” (*de slar sad pa*) instead of wrongly and nonsensically in the context of the *PsP*_{Tib} citation “he, then, awake and prideful/arrogant” (*de de nas sad par gyur zhing rlom pa dang bcas pas*).⁶³

It would appear, then, that *PsP*_{Tib} preserves fragments of an early, pre-revision translation of the *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī*. While this in itself is of interest, it remains to be investigated how many other citations in *PsP*_{Tib} represent material appropriated from older translations, and whether any links to specific extant proto-canonical collections can be established. As mentioned earlier, the editing work on the *MABh* Sanskrit manuscript cannot yet confirm that *śāstra* citations were copied into *MABh*_{Tib}, but the *sūtra* citations encountered to date affirm Pa tshab's colophon assertion that these were appropriated from the source texts. Of some interest is the *MABh*'s *Daśabhūmikasūtra* citation that immediately follows *MA* 2.1cd.⁶⁴ It does not concord well with the corresponding passages of the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* as contained in the *Avatamsakasūtra* in the Peking and Derge Kanjur editions (these editions do not have a free-standing version of the *sūtra*), but it does share its readings, with the exception of fairly minor variants, with the free-standing *Daśabhūmikasūtra* of the sTog, Phug brag, Shey and London collections.⁶⁵

⁶¹Cf., e.g., *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* P 307a3. Note also the addition of prefixes to the translations for the past participles in this corrected version of the sentence.

⁶²Cf., e.g., *PsP*_L 51.10.

⁶³Cf. *PsP*_{Tib} P 19a1; cp. with *Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī* P 307a4. Phug brag 2 does not translate the sentence.

⁶⁴Cf. de La Vallée Poussin 1907–1912: 33–37.

⁶⁵I thank Bruno Lainé of the “Tibetan Manuscripts” project for providing me with scans of the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* from the sTog, Phug brag, Shey and London collections. I have not been able to determine if the translation of the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* in the *Avatamsakasūtra* of the Peking and Derge editions is an independent translation or merely a heavily revised version of the translation found in sTog, etc.; on the basis of the limited material in the *MABh*_{Tib} citation, I suspect that it might be the latter.

Pa tshab does not specify in the verse in the *PsP*_{Tib} and *MABh*_{Tib} colophons in which he refers to his “cut-and-paste” method, or elsewhere in the colophons, whether the citations were inserted while he was still in Kashmir or if this work was done only once he had returned, after his twenty-three year stay in Kashmir, to central Tibet; he merely asserts in the colophons that the translations of these two works were executed in Kashmir and that they were revised in Lhasa on the basis of second Sanskrit manuscripts located there. I see no reason, however, not to speculate, given that the method of importing cited material was ostensibly occasionally practised already in the early translation period and was relied upon by Pa tshab’s immediate predecessor Rin chen bzang po, and given the relative intensity of mercantile and religious traffic in the western Himalayas during both dissemination periods, that much of the citation copying, or at least as much as possible, was carried out in the Ratnagupta monastery of Kashmir’s “incomparable city,” in reliance on translated source texts copied or loaned out from the personal books of visiting or resident Tibetan scholars, or, perhaps, upon consultation of source texts in a collection of Tibetan translations held in a section of the monastery’s main Sanskrit library. In the case of the *Vajramaṇḍadhāranī*, one would have to suppose that the corrected version of the translation (i.e., that found in the sTog, Peking, Gondhla, etc., collections), said in its colophon to have been translated, revised, and finalized by Śilendrabodhi, Ye shes sde and others,⁶⁶ was not available in the Ratnagupta monastery at the end of the eleventh century, but that an older form of the translation was still in circulation, or merely still available in the library, and that *PsP*_{Tib}’s passages were copied from it.

Some indications that the hypothesis of the availability of Tibetan translations in the Ratnagupta monastery may have its merits are provided by Pa tshab’s *CŚT* translation. Its colophon, in both the Peking and Derge editions, refers to the translation having been made, corrected, and finalized in the aforementioned Kashmiri monastery; reference to a revi-

⁶⁶The colophons to the *Vajramaṇḍadhāranī* translation in the Peking edition (P 312a3–4), the Derge edition (D 289b4), and in the Phug brag 1 manuscript report that the *sūtra* was translated, revised, and finalized by Śilendrabodhi, Ye shes sde, and others; the colophon to the same *sūtra* in the Gondhla collection states that Śilendrabodhi, Prajñāvarman, Ye shes sde and others translated, revised and finalized it. The colophons in sTog and Phug brag 2 do not provide information on translators or revisers.

sion having been undertaken later in Lhasa does not appear.⁶⁷ Test checks of a few of the citations in two chapters of the translated *CŚT* reveal that these citations too were copied into the main text. *Lokātītastava* verse 18, for example, quoted in Candrakīrti's commentary on *CŚ* 2.25 agrees closely with the corresponding verse in the *Lokātītastava* Tibetan translation, attesting only a couple of variants that do not affect the meaning.⁶⁸ The six *Ratnāvalī* verses (*RĀ* 2.48–51, 57–58) cited in the same section also concord, with minor variants, with the corresponding verses in the *Ratnāvalī* translation;⁶⁹ the two *Ratnāvalī* verses (*RĀ* 1.61–62) that Candrakīrti cites as support for his comments on *CŚ* 12.3 mirror those of the Tibetan source translation.⁷⁰ The *Kāśyapaparivarta* citation in *CŚT* on *CŚ* 12.11 follows, with the exception of a few words that do not affect the meaning, the source translation.⁷¹ The two verses from the *YŚ* (41–42) that are cited immediately after the above-mentioned *Lokātītastava* quotation of the second chapter are more interesting: the first is clearly a mixture of an older *YŚ* translation (it appears to be the one used by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Śilendrabodhi and Ye shes sde for their translation of the *YŚV*) and of the revised version of the verse made by Muditaśrī and Pa tshab, while the second reflects, with only a couple of insignificant differences, Muditaśrī and Pa tshab's version.⁷² The evidence is too limited for definite conclusions, but the nature of the first verse leads one to think that Pa tshab's *YŚ* revision had not been finalized when he translated the *CŚT*.⁷³ It can further be noted that all of the works from which the above

⁶⁷Gos Lo tsā ba is of the opinion that the *CŚT* was revised in Lhasa along with the *PsP*, *MABh* and *YŚV* (on the latter, see FOOTNOTE 16); cf. Roerich 1976: 342 (*Deb ther sngon po* 1984: 416).

⁶⁸Text in *CŚT* P 64a1–2 and Lindtner 1982: 134. *CŚT* attests 'gags and ma 'gags for *zhig* and *ma zhig* in *pāda* a and *skye ba* for 'byung ba in *pāda* d.

⁶⁹Text in *CŚT* P 64a7–64b3 and Hahn 1982: 59–63. The eighth/ninth-century *Ratnāvalī* translation was revised by Pa tshab and Kanakavarman.

⁷⁰Text in Tillemans 1990 [Vol. II]: 12 and Hahn 1982: 27.

⁷¹Text in Tillemans 1990 [Vol. II]: 34 and von Staël-Holstein 1926: 96.

⁷²Text in *CŚT* P 64a2–3 and Scherrer-Schaub 1991: 14 (Muditaśrī and Pa tshab's translation) and 80 (the translation imported by Jinamitra, etc., and Ye shes sde).

⁷³The colophon to the *YŚ* translation states merely that Pa tshab and Muditaśrī revised and finalized it. Also of some interest is the fact that the *Samādhirāja* 9.26 citation in *CŚT* on *CŚ* 12.3 deviates substantially from the version attested in the Kanjur collections and manuscripts used by Cüppers for his edition of the chapter but agrees, though with some variants, with the verse as cited in the *PsP*'s twenty-fifth chapter. Text in Tillemans 1990 [Vol. II]: 8 and Cüppers 1990: 42; cp. the version at *PsP*_{Tib} P 197b3–4.

CŚT citations have been taken, and indeed the majority of those quoted in the *PsP*, are not obscure but well-known, important Mahāyāna compositions, the translations of which Tibetan scholars studying and working in major centres out of country may not have had much trouble in acquiring, or acquiring access to. Of course, it is also possible that many of the, or the remaining, citations were inserted only after Pa tshab had returned to Tibet, when he was in the process of revising other translations on the basis of additional Sanskrit manuscripts with visiting non-Tibetan scholars in the temples of Lhasa.

Regardless of where the majority of the citations were copied into *PsP*_{Tib}, *MABh*_{Tib} and the *CŚT* translation, the reliance of Pa tshab and other translators on the “cut-and-paste” method is significant beyond the fact that these translations preserve fragments of older versions of translations or perhaps even of alternative translations. Unquestionably, awareness of their methods should prompt us to exercise more caution when attempting, or—in unsure cases—when tempted, to correct the text of a Sanskrit citation in a work merely on the basis of the respective citation in the Tibetan translation of the work. In the case of copied-in *sūtra* quotations, the translation of the citation’s source text may easily have been made from a Sanskrit source with readings different from those relied upon by the Indian author quoting it. The editor of a Sanskrit commentary for which a Tibetan translation is available would therefore be well advised to decide in advance whether the editing of the *sūtra* citations aims to establish and present the “Urtext” of the Sanskrit citation within the commentary (at the risk of creating a mishmash) or whether it has the more modest and probably more sensible aim of merely correcting the citation as it was available to the commentator. Extreme care is required when dealing with *śāstra* citations, which are known to be occasionally modified, for various reasons, by the Indian authors importing them; in such cases, unless the Tibetan translators noticed the changes made to the Sanskrit by the author and conscientiously emended their pasted-in citation, their Tibetan will mirror the Sanskrit of the citation’s source text but fail, potentially tragically, to reflect the intention of the author whose work they have translated.⁷⁴ Attention should also be drawn

⁷⁴A prominent example involves the discrepancy between Candrakīrti’s slightly altered citation of a passage from Bhāviveka’s *Prajñāpradīpa* and *PsP*_{Tib}’s copied-in Tibetan; cf. MacDonald 2003: 162–167 and 2008: 29–33.

to the fact that imported Tibetan citations are sometimes observed to contain a greater or lesser number of phrases, not infrequently sentences or entire sections of text, than the corresponding imported citation in the Sanskrit and that it would be reckless to spruce up or pare down the Sanskrit without good reason and/or supporting evidence. The long citation from the *Kāśyapaparivartasūtra* in the first chapter of the *PsP*, for example, appears in *PsP*_{Tib} replete with full sentences that are not attested in the *PsP*'s Sanskrit (but which do occur in the source-text translation of the *sūtra*), and missing others attested by the Sanskrit.⁷⁵

But this last point raises the question of why translators did not always attempt to precisely match up the Tibetan citations they were inserting with the text of the Sanskrit manuscripts they were in the process of translating. Why would a meticulous translator like Pa tshab not abridge the imported material from the *Kāśyapaparivartasūtra* and other works to have it better accord with the Sanskrit citations? I think there may be grounds to infer, on the basis of the incongruity between the degree to which the *PsP*'s Sanskrit is mirrored in the Tibetan text translating Candrakīrti's own words and in the Tibetan text translating his citations of other works, that more persons than just the main translators, i.e., Pa tshab and Mahāsumati, were involved in the larger *PsP* translation project, and that it was Pa tshab's assistants who were responsible for retrieving the translated source texts, locating the cited passages in them, and copying, or having a scribe copy, the Tibetan version of the citation into Pa tshab's *PsP* translation. These assistants or apprentice translators would conceivably be supplied by one of the main translators with, in the case of short citations, the Sanskrit for the entire passage, and in the case of longer citations, possibly only their beginning and closing sentences, and were expected to find the respective passages on the basis of this information. Assuming that they were entrusted with the responsibility of

⁷⁵The citation begins at *PsP*_L 47.1. For the Sanskrit and Tibetan of the source-text, see von Staël-Holstein 1926:204ff.; the discussion about what is extinguished in *nirvāna* on p. 206f. appears in *PsP*_{Tib} but not in Candrakīrti's Sanskrit. Cf. also *PsP*_L 43, n. 3, where de La Vallée Poussin states that "Le copiste abrège," pointing out that the *Akṣayamatisūtra* quotation in *PsP*_{Tib} contains a rather long sentence not attested in the Sanskrit. It is not clear to me if he is labelling Candrakīrti "the copyist" or if he thinks a later scribe dropped Sanskrit text here. De La Vallée Poussin was not aware of the fact that the Tibetan citations were insertions, and on more than one occasion in his edition, at least in the first chapter of the *PsP*, erroneously changes the Sanskrit text of citations to accord with that in *PsP*_{Tib}.

bringing the cited material into the main translation, I suspect that it was their occasional carelessness and oversight, i.e., their failure to carefully check each sentence of a citation, especially in the longer ones, against the translators' main Sanskrit manuscript, that led to too much or too little material ending up in *PsP_{Tib}*.⁷⁶ Such a practical division of labour may explain other cases of discrepancy, such as the blatant *non sequitur* that Wedemeyer encountered in Rin chen bzang po's *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, a case in which one would have to accept—if we do not consider the possibility of another individual being responsible for citation copying—that the “Great Translator” himself copied in a verse that failed to support his main text, something that is certainly not impossible, but perhaps more plausible if explained as the work of a second party. Of course, the question of later editorial interference remains open.

It is expected that further analysis of citations in Pa tshab's translations will shed more light on his workshop and sources, but only general scholarly attention to textual citations will enable us to know whether his mode of dealing with cited material was the general norm or more of an exception during the second, or even first, translation period. The situation, admittedly, can be complex even as regards root texts within commentaries, as Eli Franco has shown for the case of the *Pramāṇavārt-*

⁷⁶Related problems may have been caused by the fact that the assistants did not know Sanskrit well enough to notice all of the discrepancies between the Tibetan of the source citation and the Sanskrit of the manuscript used by the main translator(s). My thanks to William Ames (private communication) for calling my attention to this possibility.

Might these individuals responsible for scouring the translated source texts in search of cited material represent a faction of the “others” (*la sogs pa*) mentioned in some colophons? Peter Skilling (1997b: 139 and n. 120), musing over what the roles of the nameless “others” might have been, notes that the Crystal Mirror “mentions 100 translators accompanying dPal brtsegs and nearly 1,000 ‘apprentice translators’ with Klu'i rgyal mtshan.” Although his translations were undertaken in a different cultural context, one might also draw attention to the fact that Xuanzang was aided in his Sanskrit-Chinese translation work by a number of people. Upon his return to China in 645, the emperor Taizong provided Xuanzang with a team of scholars and assistants; as Deleanu (2006: 107) states, the team consisted of twelve monks who scrutinized the meaning, nine scholars in charge of editing the literary expression, an expert in Chinese lexicography, an expert in Sanskrit language and script, scholars who put the translation into writing, copyists and an administrative staff. Deleanu notes (*ibid.*, 135, n. 19) that the recording of the orally transmitted translation “often seems to have involved more than ‘writing down the dictation,’ and may have involved the editing of the text into its final form.” I do not know if the citations in Xuanzang's and others' Chinese translations have been investigated.

tika translations.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, Pa tshab's disclosure of his method for handling citations makes topical a state of affairs not infrequently encountered, but often left unreflected by scholars investigating Tibetan translations of Sanskrit works, and it will hopefully have the effect of stimulating further research.

⁷⁷See Franco 1997. Note also, e.g., the case of the *Jātakamālā*, where the root text as it appears in the *Jātakamālāṭīkā* and the *Jātakamālāpañjikā* (both only available in Tibetan) does not always correspond well with the free-standing translation of the *Jātakamālā* in the various Tanjurs but is also not an independent translation; cf. Tropper 2005: 111, n. 24 (my thanks to Dr. Kurt Tropper for this information).

Abbreviations

CŚ *Catuḥśatakakārikā*.

CŚṬ *Catuḥśatakaṭikā*.

Deb ther sngon po 'Gos lo gzhon nu dpal. *Deb ther sngon po*. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1984.

MA *Madhyamakāvatāra*.

MABh *Madhyamakāvatārabhāṣya*.

MMK *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*.

PsP *Prasannapadā*.

PsP_L L. de La Vallée Poussin, ed. *Madhyamakavṛttiḥ: Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4. St. Petersburg, 1903–1913.

RĀ *Ratnāvalī*.

YṢ(V) C. A. Scherrer-Schaub. *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti*: Commentaire à la soixantaine sur le raisonnement ou Du vrai enseignement de la causalité par le Maître indien Candrakīrti. Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhique 25. Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1991.

References

Cüppers, C. (1990). *The IXth Chapter of the Samādhirājasūtra*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

De La Vallée Poussin, L. (1907/1912). *Madhyamakāvatāra par Candrakīrti: Traduction Tibétaine*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 9. St. Petersburg.

Decler, H. (1997). “Atiśa’s Journey to Tibet”. In: *Religions of Tibet in Practice*. Ed. by D. S. Lopez. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 157–177.

- Deleanu, F. (2006). *The Chapter on the Mundane Path (Laukikamārga) in the Śrāvakabhūmi: A Trilingual Edition (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese), Annotated Translation, and Introductory Study*. Vol. 1. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Dutt, N. (1985). *Buddhism in Kashmir*. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.
- Eimer, H., ed. (1997). *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon: Papers Presented at a Panel of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995*. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Franco, E. (1997). “The Tibetan Translations of the Pramāṇavārttika 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*. Ed. by H. Krasser et al. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 277–288.
- Hahn, M. (1982). *Nāgārjuna’s Ratnāvalī*. Vol. 1: *The Basic Texts (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese)*. Indica et Tibetica 1. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Harrison, P. (1992). *Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra: A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text (Recension A) Based on Eight Editions of the Kanjur and the Dunhuang Manuscript Fragment*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Ishikawa, M. (1990). *A Critical Edition of the sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa: An Old and Basic Commentary on the Mahāvīyutpatti*. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko.
- Kramer, R. (2007). *The Great Tibetan Translator: Life and Works of rNgog Blo ldan shes rab (1059-1109)*. Munich: Indus Verlag.
- Lang, K. (1990). “Spa-tshab nyi-ma-grags and the Introduction of Prāsaṅgika Madhyamaka into Tibet”. In: *Reflections on Tibetan Culture: Essays in Memory of Turrell V. Wylie*. Ed. by L. Epstein and R. F. Sherburne. Studies in Asian Thought and Religion 12. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 127–141.
- Lindtner, C. (1982). *Nagarjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

- Lo Bue, E. (1997). "The Role of Newar Scholars in Transmitting the Indian Buddhist Heritage to Tibet (c. 750–c. 1200)". In: *Les habitants du toit du monde. Études recueillies en hommage à Alexander W. Macdonald*. Ed. by S. G. Karmay and P. Sagant. Nanterre: Publications de la Société d'ethnologie, 629–658.
- MacDonald, A. (2003). "Interpreting Prasannapadā 19.3-7 in Context: A Response to Claus Oetke". In: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 47, 143–195.
- (2008). "Recovering the Prasannapadā". In: *Critical Review for Buddhist Studies* 3, 9–38.
- Martin, D. (2008). "Veil of Kashmir: Poetry of Travel and Travail in Zhangzhungpa's 15th-Century Kāvya Reworking of the Biography of the Great Translator Rinchen Zangpo (958-1055 CE)". In: *Revue d'Études Tibétaines (Tibetan Studies in Honour of Samten Karmay, Part I)* 14, 13–56.
- Naudou, J. (1968). *Les Bouddhistes Kaśmīriens au Moyen Age*. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études 68. Translated by Brereton and Picron under the title *The Buddhists of Kaśmīr*, Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1980. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Roerich, G. N. (1976). *Blue Annals*. 2nd ed. Second Reprint 1988. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Saito, A. (1984). "A Study of the Buddhapālita-mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtti". PhD dissertation. Australian National University.
- (1995). "Problems in Translating the Mūlamadhyamakakārikā as Cited in its Commentaries". In: *Buddhist Translations: Problems and Perspectives*. Ed. by L. D. Tulku. New Delhi: Manohar, 87–96.
- Sāṅkrtyāyana, R. (1950). *Merī Jīvan Yātrā*. Vol. 2. Ihālābād: Kitāba Mahala.
- Scherrer-Schaub, C. A. (1999). "Towards a Methodology for the Study of Old Tibetan Manuscripts: Dunhuang and Tabo". In: Scherrer-Schaub and Steinkellner 1999, 3–36.

- Scherrer-Schaub, C. A. and E. Steinkellner, eds. (1999). *Tabo Studies II: Manuscripts, Texts, Inscriptions, and the Arts*. Serie Orientale Roma 87. Rome: Istituto italiano per l’Africa e l’Oriente.
- Seyfort Ruegg, D. (1973). “On Translating the Buddhist Canon: A Dictionary of Indo-Tibetan Terminology in Tibetan and Mongolian; the Dag yig mkhas pa’i ’byung gnas of Rol pa’i rdo rje”. In: *Studies in Asian Art and Culture: Commemorative Volume on the 71st Birthday of Acharya Rāghu Vira*. Ed. by P. Ratnam. Vol. 3. Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 243–261.
- (2000). *Three Studies in the History of Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka Philosophy*. Studies in Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka Thought, Part 1. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 50. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Skilling, P. (1997a). “From bKa’ bstan bcos to bKa’ ’gyur and bsTan ’gyur”. In: Eimer 1997, 87–111.
- (1997b). *The Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*. Vol. 2. Sacred Books of the Buddhists 46. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Snellgrove, D. (1987). *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism: Indian Buddhists and Their Tibetan Successors*. Boston: Shambala.
- Steinkellner, E. (1986). *Dharmottaras Paralokasiddhi: Nachweis der Wiedergeburt; zugleich eine Widerlegung materialistischer Thesen zur Natur der Geistigkeit*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 15. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Tillemans, T. J. F. (1990). *Materials for the Study of Āryadeva, Dharmapāla and Candrakīrti: The Catuḥśataka of Āryadeva, Chapters XII and XIII, with the Commentaries of Dharmapāla and Candrakīrti; Introduction, Translation, Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese Texts, Notes*. 2 vols. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 24. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.

- Tropper, K. (2005). *Die Jātaka-Inschriften im skor lam chen mo des Klosters Zha lu: Einführung, textkritische Studie, diplomatische Edition der Paneele 1–8 mit Sanskritparallelen und deutscher Übersetzung*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 63. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Tucci, G. (1988). *Rin-chen-bzañ-po and the Renaissance of Buddhism in Tibet Around the Millenium*. Ed. by L. Chandra. Trans. by N. K. Smith. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- Van der Kuijp, L. (1985). “Notes on the Transmission of Nagarjuna’s Ratnavali in Tibet”. In: *The Tibet Journal* 10, 3–19.
- Von Staël-Holstein, A. (1926). *The Kāçyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class Edited in the Original Sanskrit, in Tibetan and in Chinese*. Reprinted Tokyo 1977. Shanghai.
- Vose, K. A. (2009). *Resurrecting Candrakīrti: Disputes in the Tibetan Creation of Prāsaṅgika*. Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Wedemeyer, C. (2006). “Tantalising Traces of the Labours of the Lotsāwas: Alternative Translations of Sanskrit Sources in the Writings of rJe Tsong kha pa”. In: *Tibetan Buddhist Literature and Praxis: Studies in its Formative Period, 900–1400*. Ed. by R. Davidson and C. Wedemeyer. Leiden: Brill, 149–182.
- Witzel, M. (1994). “Kashmiri Manuscripts and Pronunciation”. In: *A Study of the Nīlamata: Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir*. Ed. by Y. Ikari. Kyoto: Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, 1–53.
- Yoshimizu, C. (1996). *Die Erkenntnislehre des Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka: Nach dem Tshig gsal ston thun gyi tshad ma’i rnam bśad des ’Jam dbyaṅs bśad pa’i rdo rje*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 37. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.