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Chinese Sūtras in Tibetan Translation
A Preliminary Survey

Jonathan A. Silk

Abstract
Most Tibetan sūtra translations were produced from Indic sources, in principle in Sanskrit. However, just as the sources of Tibetan Buddhism are not solely Indian, the sources of scriptures translated into Tibetan are also not uniquely Indian. The present contribution identifies a set of sūtra translations in Tibetan based not on Sanskrit sources, but rather on Chinese. Many of these were evidently produced in Dunhuang. Their study will inform us not only about the state of Buddhism in the 8th-10th centuries in the Tibetan empire, but also provide a unique window into their Chinese sources, since the Tibetan translations offer a contemporary educated reading of these texts. They represent, therefore, in addition to their cultural value, a priceless source for the study of Buddhist Chinese language.

Keywords
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All translation is commentary. This truism is a vital key to one of the motivations behind the study of Classical translations of Buddhist scriptures, namely, that such works can provide interpretations often significantly differently informed than our own. The translator, in setting the source text into a new linguistic frame, interprets it through his own lens, and that lens, in a traditional context, is sure to have been grounded in a vast and deep knowledge. In cases in which we no longer have access to the ‘originals’ from which translations were made, the utility of the translation is obvious. But even when we have good evidence for the putative sources themselves—a Sanskrit manuscript for a sūtra available also in Tibetan translation, for instance—translations continue to offer valuable perspectives. Such works have, of course, long been used to ‘correct’ Sanskrit texts, the transmission of which is not perfect, this being common in Buddhist studies when Tibetan translations are deployed to shed light on Indic works. But other more interpretive uses are not to be overlooked.

The Indo-Tibetan axis is not, moreover, the only relevant or interesting one in this regard. Tibetan translations of another type also provide valuable insight, these being translations made from sources in Chinese. More than a century ago, Paul Pelliot (1908: 513) pointed out that a number of Tibetan texts he had just discovered in Dunhuang were, in fact, translated from Chinese; he later added that the same is true for some texts found in the Kanjurs (1914: 143). In pre-modern times already the Lhan dkar ma and 'Phang thang ma Imperial

1 This introduction incorporates material previously published in Silk 2014. I owe debts large and small for corrections, additions and information to too many colleagues to name, but I cannot omit mention of my student, Channa Li, whose own research deals with the same corpus.
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catalogues, dating respectively to 812 and 830 (or thereabouts; the exact dates are disputed), had set aside separate sections to record translations from Chinese—separate because the default position was already in this early time translation from Sanskrit. Chinese translations of Indic texts, meanwhile, although on the whole less mechanically produced than most Tibetan translations, have also long been employed as witnesses (most basically, for the purposes of providing *termini ante quem*), in addition to their obvious function of shedding light on Buddhism in East Asia.

When such Chinese translations are proposed as windows onto Indic texts, however, a number of questions arise. Some of these are motivated by the obvious fact that, whereas Tibetan translations from Sanskrit give the impression of a sort of literalness which permits one confidently to retrovert an Indic Vorlage,² Chinese translations, in contrast, seem to render the spirit in preference to the letter. Their relation to their source texts aside, a basic challenge remains, namely, how to interpret the Chinese texts themselves. That is to say, in the first place one task facing us in our quest to utilize these translations is determining how they were understood by their intended audiences, or by some traditional audience. In this regard, one source might be the hardly studied Manchu translations which, however, are quite modern, belonging to the latter part of the 18th century. The insight they provide, therefore, can reflect only understandings of this period, far removed from the time of composition of the texts, and even from the social and intellectual setting of most of the historical readers of these materials. In contrast, the much older store of relatively early translations into Tibetan, most of which appear to date to between the eighth and tenth centuries, provides a potentially excellent set of reference points for medieval Chinese Buddhist understandings of the scriptures.³

Except in the field of Chan studies, and therein especially in relation to the so-called Bsam yas debates, which have garnered significant attention over the past decades, these materials rendered from Chinese into Tibetan have been largely overlooked in scholarship. While exceptions exist, such as the important contributions of Oetke 1977 and Stein 1983, an enormous amount remains to be done. One possible result of such studies is that what may appear to us today as a style of Chinese translation more free than literal was understood instead by contemporary readers as quite precise indeed. Evidence for the precision of the Chinese renderings comes from their Tibetan translations, in which we find, for instance, that technical terms are regularly recognized in their Chinese guise. (This process may have been aided by glossaries, such as Pelliot tibétain 1257, although at least this particular work may have been descriptive rather than prescriptive; see Kimura 1985.⁴) In other words, the results

---

² This is an impression which, as anyone who has carefully studied them, however, must conclude, is not always justified. See Silk 2016.
³ Some translations are much later, but these are of less concern in the present context.
⁴ According to Akamatsu 1988: 378, the list of 85 sūtra and treatise titles in P. tib. 1257 is based on juan 8 of the *Datang neidan lu* 大唐內典録, the *Lidai zhongjingjian ruazang lu* 歷代中經見入藏録, though this is questioned by Apple and Apple 2017: 99, part of their argument being that the manuscript itself shows that the Tibetan titles were written first, but they conclude that the relation may well be complex. In any event, Akamatsu speculates that the manuscript contains the catalogue of the holdings of some monastic library, perhaps the Dayun si 大雲寺, a name mentioned on the manuscript itself. (That the *Datang neidan lu* was used to organize canons at the largest monastery in Dunhuang, the Longxing si 龍興寺, is confirmed by the manuscript P. 3432 [Rong 1999–2000: 258].) Akamatsu remarks that in his enumeration titles 9, 14, 16, 20, 36 and 62 correspond to texts believed to have been translated from Chinese. Apple and Apple number these rather 9, 15, 17, 21, 37, 63. Since their article is much more accessible, as well as much more clearly presented, I follow their numbering. See below in the listings. For that Hakamaya 1984: 177, P. tib. 1257 records the old, pre-standardized Tibetan
of even the relatively small-scale studies undertaken thus far allow us to conclude that the Tibetan translators understood the Chinese renderings in a very precise and technical manner, which enabled them to render the Chinese equivalents of originally Indic terminology into Tibetan in a manner every bit as precise as what we find in translations made directly into Tibetan from Indic originals. Although it is too early to say for certain or to appreciate the matter in detail, we are probably justified to expect that investigations of such translations will help us better appreciate the value of Chinese translations, not only in their own right and for the study of Chinese Buddhism, but beyond to an appreciation of them as meaningful and precise renderings of Indic materials into an idiom which remains for us still insufficiently understood, namely ‘Buddhist Chinese.’

Below I offer a list of Tibetan sūtra translations from Chinese. However, I have little doubt that other examples of Tibetan renderings from Chinese remain unrecognized. For instance, Dunhuang manuscript Pelliot tibétain 89 preserves two Tibetan translations, namely those of the Maitreyaparipṛcchā and Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā. Until I noted them in Silk 2014, these had remained unrecognized as renderings from Chinese. I will soon publish an edition of the latter text, and the former will be published by my student, Channa Li. I have also prepared an edition of the Smaller Sukhāvatīvyūha sūtra, focused on a fragmentary Tibetan translation (the final two thirds of the text are preserved) of Kumārajīva’s Chinese rendering, the Amituo jing 阿彌陀經. This, like the Tibetan translation of one of the Chinese versions of the Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha sūtra, rendered from Bodhiruci’s Wuliangshou rulai hui 無量濤如來會 (something more than half of the Tibetan text is preserved, of which I have an edition in preparation), were long ago identified by Akamatsu Kōshō, but no further work was done. What these only recently identified, or largely ignored, materials illustrate is the potential for further identifications of similarly overlooked materials. For the moment, therefore, we must consider ourselves on the whole to be at the very beginning of the long task of coming to grips with these sources.

Preliminary List of Tibetan Scripture Translations from Chinese

This list attempts to gather references to all extant pre-modern scripture (sūtra) translations in Tibetan made from Chinese. It does not list quotations of sūtras found within texts, such as some Chan related works or compendia from Dunhuang, although these can also contain valuable materials (Obata 1975, Kimura 1986). It also does not list translations which are not known to be extant, even though they may be listed in the Lhan dkar ma catalogue or elsewhere, and their (former) existence is surely important for an understanding of the historical situation. The line, moreover, between sūtra and tantra may not always be clear; I have avoided what seemed to me obviously tantric materials, leaving their study to others competent in this field.

For Kanjur item numbering and the text of Kanjur colophons I follow the indications at http://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/xml3/xml/. For the Lhan dkar ma, I refer to Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, for the ’Phang thang ma Kawagoe 2005 (the numbering in Halkias 2004 differs

vocabulary, rather than the equivalents for Chinese terms. This question is also considered by Apple and Apple 2017.
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sightly), and for Bu ston’s catalogue Nishioka 1980, 1981, 1983.\textsuperscript{5} I provide minimal bibliographic references; for some texts there is already considerable secondary literature, but since my goal here is only to introduce the scope of the available material, I have not aimed at exhaustive references. Again for practical reasons I have not systematically surveyed the Dunhuang manuscripts. Hence, indications of Tibetan manuscript versions below are also certainly only partial. For the same reasons, I have not listed Dunhuang Chinese manuscripts, although it will be essential to study these, when available, alongside the Tibetan translations. (See in this regard especially the note under sūtra T. 374 in the list.)

Merely for the sake of convenience the texts are listed here in the order of the Chinese source texts as found in the Taishō edition, without any implication that this order is important for any reason (in fact, it is profoundly unhistorical), and without implication of the relation borne by the Chinese text now edited in the Taishō edition to that actually used by the Tibetan translators. That is, it is not necessarily the case that the Chinese text edited in the Taishō edition (primarily based ultimately on the Second Koryō 高麗 printing) reflects in its details the Chinese text available to the Tibetan translators; the evidence of the Amituo jing is that it does not, while the Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā presents a slightly more optimistic picture. (It seems to me likely that texts which had received more attention historically tend to have more complex textual transmissions, a hypothesis which should be empirically tested.) But these are only the most preliminary of findings. Tibetan translations whose Chinese original is not yet identified are listed in alphabetical order of their (putative) Sanskrit title. These Sanskrit titles should only be used for ease of reference; in many cases there can be no assurance that a text was known in India by such a title at all. Following this is a list of texts which may be translations from Chinese, but whose status remains unclear. This includes a few items previously considered to belong to the category of Tibetan translations from Chinese, but which I now believe are to be excluded.

It is highly likely that there are items listed below as translations from Chinese whose identification as such is erroneous, or at least overly simplistic,\textsuperscript{6} and that translations which should be listed as belonging to this category are missing. Future studies will clarify outstanding questions, and raise new ones.

Since this material has for the most part hardly begun to be studied as a whole, I offer at this moment only a single observation about the content of this list. The Mahārātanakūṭa collection consists of 49 texts, and seems to have been established—at least in the form in which we now know it—by Bodhiruci in the beginning of the 8th century in China. The arrangement of the Mahārātanakūṭa collection in the Tibetan Kanjurs is modeled on Bodhiruci’s collection as transmitted in China; there is no evidence for the previous existence of a Mahārātanakūṭa collection in India which could have served as the model for the Tibetan structuring. It is therefore most interesting to find that of the 49 texts of the Mahārātanakūṭa collection, fully 10 of them are represented in the list of Tibetan sūtras translated from Chinese (without, to be sure, any reference in colophons, for instance, to the inclusion of these texts within such a collection). At least as a first reaction, one cannot escape the impression that some Tibetan scholars became familiar with the extent of the Mahārātanakūṭa

---

\textsuperscript{5} Strictly speaking, chapter 4 of his History of Buddhism, the Bde bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsing rab rin po che'i mdzod ces bya ba.

\textsuperscript{6} That is, it seems likely that some Tibetan versions are hybrid products, taking account of both Sanskrit and Chinese sources. See Li 2016. For an interesting apparent parallel situtation in Uigur, see Porció 2003.
collection through Bodhiruci’s compilation and, finding that some components of this collection were not yet available in Tibetan translation, made a systematic effort to complete the compendium by rendering the thus-far unavailable sūtras from Chinese into Tibetan. If so, this fact becomes, reflexively as it were, one piece of evidence suggestive of the non-existence of a Mahāratnakūta collection in India (at least in the form in which it was known to Tibetans not long after the time of Bodhiruci himself), and, correspondingly, support for the hypothesis that its compilation was due to the initiative of Bodhiruci (despite the oft-cited statement of Xuanzang that he brought the sūtra collection to China with him from India). I hope future research will also examine this hypothesis.

Kanjurs:
- Bathang: Bathang manuscript Kanjur (Eimer 2012)
- D: Derge blockprint Kanjur
- Gondhla: Gondhla manuscript Kanjur (Tauscher 2008)
- L: London (Shel dkar) manuscript Kanjur
- N: Narthang blockprint Kanjur
- P: Peking blockprint Kanjur
- S: sTog manuscript Kanjur
- T: Tokyo manuscript Kanjur
- V: Ulan Bator manuscript Kanjur

Dunhuang manuscripts:
- IOL: India Office Library, London manuscripts
- P. tib.: Pelliot tibétain, Paris manuscripts

Catalogues:
- Lhan dkar ma: edition Herrmann-Pfandt 2008
- T: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō

T. 156: Dafangbian fobaoen jing 大方便佛報恩經 = D 353, P 1022: Thabs mkhas pa chen po sangs rgyas drin lan bsab pa’i mdo. (In addition to text 31, Phug brag 218 also contains this text in its first six folios, Samten 1992: 83n2.) NSV colophon: rgya nag las bod du ’gyur ba la ’gyur gsar bead ma byas pa’o ||. Lhan dkar ma 253, ’Phang thang ma 232. While Gondhla 19.8 has this text, in Gondhla 21.7 we find a different translation: Sangs rgyas kyi thabs chen po’i drin la blan pa’ichos kyi yi ge | Sa’i thabs chen po’i drin la glan ba’i chos kyi yi ge, discussed by Tauscher 2008: xx–xxi.

---

7. For convenience see Pedersen 1980: 60–61. Sakurabe 1930: 134 begins his essay by citing the Līdai sanbāoji 歷代三寶記 (T. 2034 [XLIX] 103a21; see Chavannes 1905: 353 for a translation) reference to Jñānagupta’s having seen a *Ratnakūta (Baoji 賓帙) in what may be Karghalik (Zhejue 恆迦), in Central Asia, which for Sakurabe places the Mahāratnakūta collection as a whole in the sixth century. It seems to me rather that the reference can only be to the so-called Kāśyapaparivarta, that is, the Ratnakūta par excellence, all the more so as immediately following in the list comes Lengjia 読伽, that is, the Lāṇkāvātāra-sūtra. In Indian sources without exception Ratnakūta refers only to what we commonly know as the Kāśyapaparivarta, one of the 49 texts of what is now the Mahāratnakūta collection.
As noted in Silk 2008: 177n1, for the text’s title in Tibetan the colophon quoted above gives only the translation Thabs mkhas pa chen po sangs rgyas drin lan bsab pa zhes bya ba’i mdo, but the text (in versions other than Gondhla 21.7) opens with the following: rgya’i [S rgya gar] skad du ] de’i phang byan phur po’u in kyeng su phim de’i ir (for variants see Tauscher 2008: 46n124). This is a transliteration not only of Dařjangbiàn fóhàoēn jìng 大方便佛報恩經, but also of the following reference to the first section of the text, xūpin 序品 (su phim), and diyī 第一 (de’i ir).


T. 310 (13): Āyuṣmaṇa-nanda-garbhāvakrāntinirdeśa: Fowei A’nan shuo chutai hui 佛為阿難說處胎會 (Bodhiruci) = D 58: Tshe dang ldan pa dga’ bo mngal du ’jug pa bstan pa. According to Kritzer 2012: 133, the Tibetan title of this translation and that of the following (D 57) were switched, since chutai 處胎 corresponds to mngal na gnas pa while rutaizang 入胎藏 corresponds to mngal du ’jug pa. NST colophon: lo tstsha ba ’gos Cho grub kyis rgya nag gi [N rgya’i] dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa. Lhan dkar ma 38, ’Phang thang ma 683. Most important is Kritzer 2012; see also Sakurabe 1930: 153–154; Ueyama 1990: 126–129; Kritzer 2014.


T. 374: *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra: Da panniepan jing* 大般涅槃經 (Dharmakṣema) = D 119, P 787: *Yongs su mya ngan las ’das pa chen po’i mdo*. D colophon: mdo mya ngan las ’das pa chen po rgyan nag nas bsgyur pa ’di | rgya nag gyi mkhan po Wang phab zhun dang | dharma’i ghzi ’dzin Dge ba’i blo gros dang | lo tsā ba Rgya mtsho’i
sdes bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa’o. Tr. by Wang phab zhun [Woon 2012: 13–17 on this Chinese name]. Dge ba’i blo gros and Rgya mtsho’i sde. Lhan dkar ma 249, ’Phang thang ma 229. Yuyama 1981: 12–13. Woon 2012, though unpublished, is excellent. Satō 2012 summarizes the unpublished research of Arakawa 2009. The key point is that there are at least two recensions of T. 374, the Tibetan agreeing with the text preserved for instance in the Dunhuang manuscript Or 8210/S. 1833 (Ch.76.X.5).

T. 411: Daśacakrakṣitigarbha: Dasheng daijì dizang shilun jìng 大乘大集地藏十輪經 (Xuanzang) = D 239, P 905: ’Dus pa chen po las sa’i snying po’i ’khor lo bcu pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo. Tr. by Hwa shang Zab mo and Rnam par mi rtog pa. Apple 37: ’khor lo bcu pa’i mdo / 方廣十輪經. S 71 colophon: bande Rnam par mi rtog pa rgya las bsgyur ba’o | mdo ’dir skad gsar bead kyis gtan la ma phab pa’i ’gyur rnying pa ’ga’ zhig gda’o. Lhan dkar ma 82, ’Phang thang ma 40.

T. 452: Foshuo guan Mile pusa shangsheng doushuaitian jìng 佛說觀彌勒菩薩上生兜率天經 (attributed wrongly to Juqu Jingsheng 湖漿京聲; this is rather a Central Asian composition than a translation as such) = D 199: Byang chub sms pa’i byams pa dga’ldan gnam du skye ba blangs pa’i mdo. DSV colophon: zhu ba’i lo tā ba bande Pab tong [S ban dhe ye pa’b tong; V ban de pa’b stong] dang | bande Shes rab sengges rgya’i dpe las bsgyur. Tauscher 2008: 77 and n182 quotes the transcription (to which I make one correction) Gondhla: Kwan byi log po sa zhong she te ’i shwad thed kyeng, LS: Kwan byi log po sa zhong she te ’u swad then kyeng, D: Kwan ji li’u phu sa zhang shyan ten shi sthyan kyin.


T. 665: Suvarṇabhāsottama: Jin guangming zuishengwang jìng 金光明最勝王經 (Yijing 義淨) = D 555, P 174. Gser ’od dam pa mchog tu rnam par rgyal ba’i mdo sde’i rgyal po theg pa chen po’i mdo. Lhan dkar ma 251, ’Phang thang ma 231. SV colophon: zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang lo tsa ba bcom ldan ’das kyi ring lugs pa | ban dhe Chos grub kyis rgya’i dpe la bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa. From the large literature: Nobel 1937, 1944, 1958; Oetke 1977; de Jong 1979; Okamoto 1987; Ueyama 1990: 121–124. See now Radich 2015, who suggests that D 556, P 175 may contain elements translated from Chinese; in addition, other translations from Chinese may have existed which are now lost. The matter is very complex. See also Li 2016.


Cp. D 107, P 775. D colophon, erroneously: ’phags pa lang kar gshegs pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo ji snyed pa rdzogs so | bcom ldan ’das kyi ring lugs pa ’glos Chos grub kyis rgya’i dpe las bsgyur te gtan la phab pa’o.


T. 784: Sishi’erzhang jing 四十二章經 = D 359a (mdo sde, ah 281b1–289a3): h.pho bsho [= 佛說] zi ši īl tāng kyiing, Dum bu zhe gnyis pa zhes bya ba’i mdo. Colophon: de lta bu’i khungs dang ldan pa’i mdo ’di sngon bod du ma ’gyur zhiung rgya’i bka’ ’gyur na bzhugs pa las gnam skyong gong ma’i bkas manydzu’i skad du bsgyur zhiung bod skad du bka’ bcu su b.ha ga shre ya d.hwā dza dang dka’ [> bka’] bceu d.hyā nā ri śṭāṁ byā sa gnyis gyi bsgyur | sōg skad du rab ’byams pa pra dznyo da ya byā sas bsgyur ba | rgyal bstan la lhag par dad pa’i sbyin bdag hīṅg līn gyis chos sbyin rgya cher spel ba’i phyir dngul srang brgyas skad bzhī shan sbyar ba’i spar bsgrubs te ci lcogs shig spyar nas zhih mchod dam par gyur pa nams la phul ba’i dge ba’i rtsa bas rgyal bstan rin po che dar zhih rgyas la yun ring du gnas ba dang ’jig rten khamṣu nad dang mu ge ’khrugs rtsod nam yang mi ’dung zhih ma gyur sems can thams cad myur ba nyid du bla na med pa’i byang chen thob par gyur cig. Edition Feer 1868 (Chinese, Tibetan, Mongolian). Chinese translated in English several times.


T. 998: Parinatacakra [or: Parināmacakra]: Foshuo huixianglun jing 佛說迴向輪經 (*Śīla- dharma, Shiluodamo 尸羅達摩) = D 242, P 908: Yongs su bsngo ba’i ’khor lo zhes bya ba


manuscript in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (BSB Cod.tibet 922: 211b–213a [BSB ID 11814440]), the colophon of which attributes the translation of this sūtra to Jinamitra and Ye shes sde, but goes on to question this: ‘phags pa thar pa chen po phyogs su rgyas pa ’gyod tshangs kyi sdig sbyang ba ste | sangs rgyas yongs su grub pa bkod pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo rdzogs so || || rgyar gar gyi mkhan po dzi na mi tra dang | zhus chen gyi lo tsā ba bandhe ye shes sdes zhus te gtan la phab pa’o’ || || [smaller letters] ’di la kha cig ’phags yul gyi skad dod med par yid gnyis su gzung ste klan kar byed pa dag rang la chos dang chos min ’byed pa’i dngos stobs kyi yon tan sna gcig med par ltar snang khengs dreg s la bsco nas rgyal ba’i bka’ dri ma med pa la’ang ma gus pa’i log rtog sun ’byin byed pa ni nang pa sang rgyas pa’i phyi rol tu gyur pa’i mu stegs pa zhes bya ba de ’di las logs su mi smra zhung | ’gyur khyad par dbang gis ’di dang ’di’i rigs mthun ji snyed rang cag las mam dpyod mi dman pa’i sngon byon mkhas grub chos spyan ldan pa rnam gsis mdo yang dag tu bzshed nas gsung rab rin po che’i khrud du bzhugs su gsol ba yin pas chos spong mthams med kyi las mi gsog cing bag yod par bya | ’di spar du sgrub skabs kyang kham sod kyi bka’ ’gyur spar ma thams cad dang | khyad par gangs ljongs rgyal khab chen po’i ma phyi chen mo sogs dpe khungs btสน u du ma dang bsdur zhung dag par bgyis pa yin pas kun gyes yid brtan rung par yod do ||. Chinese studied in Makita 1976: 290–303.


T. 2883: Saddharmarāja: Fawang jing 法王經 = D 243, P 909: Dam pa’i chos kyi rgyal po theg pa chen po’i mdo. DS (S 216, 220) colophon: sngon rgya las ’gyur ba’i rnying pa skad gsar gys ma bcos par snang. Lhan kar 243, ’Phang thang ma 254. IOL J 222 + 264 (van Schaik 2014: 28, §2 claims that “[t]hough not previously noticed, these two manuscripts together make a complete item” but Okimoto 1978 already fully explained this reconstruction of the two separately catalogued items), 223, 265, 266, 267, P. tib. 624, 2105.2. Edition and translation (reproduction of the manuscript) from P. tib. 2105 in Lalou 1961; edition of Chinese in Okimoto 1978, 1998: 278–330; According to Stein 1983: 19, citing several Japanese scholars, all Dunhuang manuscripts are identical to the Kanjur version, except P. tib. 2105 (van Schaik claims the same, without however referring either to Stein or to the Japanese scholars). The colophon of this manuscript reads: ha se’i gwan ’dva’i to seng lyog peng pab ha’i gys | chos rgyal gyi mdo ’di | mnjug chad pa rgya’i gpe [> dpe] las bsgyur pa’o, understood by Okimoto to mean (transcribed) “河西管内都僧録<沙>門法海 [that is, the Śramaṇa Fahai, Chief Saṃgha Registrar (a title in use from 848–914) from the Hexi administrative jurisdiction] translated this Dharma King sūtra from the authoritative Chinese version.” I believe that Okimoto’s suggestion of an accidentally omitted 沙 is more plausible than other suggested Chinese
reconstructions. [The summary here intentionally skips over the many problems raised by the above.]


Shiwang jing 十王經 = Beom ldan 'das kyi gzhin rje la lung bstan pa dang | 'khor rnams la bshos ston bdun tshings bya ba dang | sangs rgyas kyi zhung du skye ba dang | Iha'i pho nya bstan pa zhes pa'i mdo. Translation and reproduction of the Tibetan text in Beroumyský 2012; Chinese in Du 1989; Teiser 1994.


Chinese Not Yet Identified:

und Titel her eindeutig mit dem lHan-Teiteleintrag zu identifizieren ist.” Sakurabe 1930–1932: 292n.


Samādhicakra: D 241, P 907: *Ting nge’ dzin gyi’ khor lo zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo.* Lhasa colophon 242 (Sakurabe 1930–1932: 353n credits this to Narthang): rgya gar gyi mkhan po Shī la dha rma dang | bande Rnam par mi rtog pas rgya las bsgyur ba. The same is found in the Derge Kanjur dkar chag (lakṣmī 131a7). This is closely related with the following text P 908, Pariṇāmacakra, for which see above, T. 998. Saerji 2010 refers to T. 356 Foshuo baoji sanmei wenshushili pasa wen fashen jing 佛說寶積三味文殊師利菩薩問法身經 and T. 355 Rujājīe tixing jing 入法界體性經 and to D 118, P. 786, Rin po che’i mtha’, Ratnakoṭi, and provides a collated edition of all versions of this text and the Pariṇāmacakra, with the Tibetan drawn from D.


**Questionable cases:**


T. 310 (11): Raśmisamantamukta-nirdeśa / Prabhāsādhana: *Chuxian guangming hui* 出現光明會 = D 55: ’Od zer kun tu bkye ba’i le’u; P 760 (11), Mustang: ’Od zer kun du bkye ba bstan pa; LST: ’Od zer bsgrub pa; V: ’Od zer bsgrub pa, but colophon: ’Od zer rab tu bkye ba’i le’u ste ’dus pa bceu geig pa. Several Kanjurs refer to the text as a ’dus pa rather than a le’u. According to Sakurabe 1930: 153, it follows Bodhiruci’s Chinese translation exactly. Given the frequency with which Mahāratnakūṭa texts were translated from Chinese, the matter should be examined.

T. 592: Devatāsūtra: *Tian qingwen jing* 天請問經 (Xuanzang). D 329: *lha’i mdo,* no colophon in any edition. Apple 35 has *lhas dris pa’i mdo* alongside this Chinese title. However, at least P. tib. 732 seems to have the text title as *lhas gsol pa.* We have many Sanskrit sources, edited by Vinītā 2010: 259–303. As she notes, however, P. tib. 732, which
apparently parallels Gondhla 24.18, differs significantly from the version preserved in Kanjurs. Other Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts are P. tib. 103, 731, Stein 370 (3, 4, in Dalton and van Schaik 2006: 104).

T. 680: Buddhabhūmi: Fodi jing 佛地經 (Xuanzang) = D 275, P 941: Sangs rgyas kyi sa (also Apple 33). DN, Gondhla colophon: rgya gar gyi mkhan po Dzi na mi tra dang | Shi lendra bo dhi dang | Pradznyā barma dang | zhu chen gyi lo tsā ba bande Ye shes sdes tī ka dang sbyar te gsar du bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa. However, S colophon: sngon rgya las ’gyur ba rnying pa brda ma bcos pa’o. Despite this indication, a quick comparison of the texts in Tibetan and Chinese as edited in Nishio 1940: I.1–24 (Tib.), II.151–164 (Chn.) (with trans. II.165–178) suggests that at least the Tibetan version preserved in the Kanjurs was not rendered from Xuanzang’s Chinese.

[T. 1307: Foshuo beidou qixing yannming jing 佛說北斗七星延命經.] The Sme bdun zhes bya ba skar ma’i mdo, P 1028, is translated from some undermined source (not T. 1307, which is however related), perhaps a lost Yuan dynasty Chinese version of the ‘Great Bear Sūtra,’ according to Franke 1990: 91. The Tibetan is edited and translated in Panglung 1991. See Mollier 2008: 134–173. Concerning the translation, the colophon seems to me unclear (Elverskog 2006: 117–118), but according to Matsukawa 2004: 203, “It is the only Tibetan Buddhist scripture that clearly notes that its source was Mongolian.”

[T. 2887: Fumu enzhong jing 父母恩重經.] Apple 86 lists this Chinese title with the Tibetan pha ma’i drin lan bstan pha, which corresponds to Lhan dkar ma 263: Pha ma’i drin lan bsab pa’i mdo. Phug brag F 218 contains two texts: Thabs mkhas pa chen po | pha ma’i drin lan bsab pa’i mdo, the first six folios of which are mentioned above under T. 156, above. Bu ston 48. Berounský 2012: 89–99; Makita 1976: 50–60. English from Chinese in Arai 2005. However, at least the text preserved in the second portion of F 218 does not correspond to T. 2887. Moreover, it is not certain that this is translated from Chinese at all. If it is, its original has yet to be identified. (Special thanks to Dr. H. Eimer for remarks on this item.)

Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodana: Lhan dkar ma 257 considers this as translated from Chinese (so too the Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nying ‘od, Schaeffer and van der Kuijp 2009: 11.8), but ’Phang thang ma 74 does not. Miyazaki 2007 argues that the attribution is in error. It is possible that another now lost translation was recorded in earlier sources.

Arthavistara nāma dharmaparyāya: D 318, P 984: Don rgyas pa zhes bya ba’i chos kyi rnam grangs. Not in Lhan dkar ma, but listed as translated from Chinese in the Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nying ‘od, Schaeffer and van der Kuijp 2009: 11.15. See ’Phang thang ma 262, Bu ston 52.

Bodhisattvaprātimokṣa-catuṣkārihāra: D 248, P 914: Byang chub rsems dpa’i so sor thar ba chos bzhis sgrub pa. If the text is properly identified, Lhan dkar ma 259 wrongly classifies it, as does the Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nying ‘od, Schaeffer and van der Kuijp 2009:
11.10. The text is studied in Fujita 1988.

Dge bcu dang du blang ba'i mdo: Lhan dkar ma 266, 'Phang thang ma 716. IOL Tib J 606, mentioned by Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, seems likely to be only vaguely related.


Rgyal bu kun tu dge ba'i mdo: Lhan dkar ma 269, 'Phang thang ma 731. F 111, ST 268, V 316: rgyal po kun tu dge zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.

Upāyakausālya. According to Sakurabe 1930: 163; 1930–1932: 251n, 360n, this Tibetan translation is closest to the Dasheng fangbian hui 大乘方便會 (T. 310 [38], translated by Nandi 難提). For Tatz 1994: 17, however, the correspondence is rather to the Huishang pusa wen dashanquan jing 慧上菩薩問大善權經 (T. 345, by Dharmarakṣa 笛法護) = D 261, P. 927: Thabs mkhas pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo. Lhan dkar ma 173, 'Phang thang ma 152, 701? [Cp. D 82: Upāyakausālyajñānottarabodhisattvaparipṛcyḥ: Lhan dkar ma 62.] Tatz 1994 (he also prepared a typewritten edition, privately circulated). Examination of the text suggests that it is not a translation of either T. 310 (38) or T. 345. The Tibetan texts may not be translated from Chinese at all, as suggested in Li 2016: 218–223. Channa Li continues to investigate the problem.

Vimalakirtinirdeśa: P. tib. 610 and 611 contain fragments of a Tibetan translation of the Vimalakirtinirdeśa. Referring to de Jong 1968–1969 (see earlier de Jong 1955), Stein 1983: 29n39 wrote: “Undoubtedly, it is a question of a translation from Chinese, but de Jong has found that the original is neither the Chinese translation of Kumārajīva, nor that of Xuanzang.” However, what de Jong (1968–1969: 7) has more precisely said is: “Le No. 610 n’utilise pas le vocabulaire de la Mahāvyutpatti. Il est possible qu’il s’agit d’une recension primitive de la traduction de Dharmatāśīla revue plus tard après la compilation de la Mahāvyutpatti. Il se peut aussi que le No. 610 ait été traduit à Touen-houang où il fut trouvé. Dans ce dernier cas, le texte à la base aurait pu être une traduction chinoise.” Thus he hypothetically accepts that a priori it could have been translated from Chinese. However, after mentioning the volume of manuscripts of Kumārajīva’s Chinese translation found at Dunhuang, de Jong goes on: “Si l’on avait trouvé une traduction tibétaine basée sur celle de Kumārajīva, cela n’aurait eu rien de surprenant. Cependant le No. 610 s’écarte essentiellement de la traduction de Kumārajīva comme de celle de Hiuan-tsang. Il n’est pas raisonnable de supposer que le no. 610 soit traduit sur une recension chinoise inconnue.” The conclusion he draws from this is that: “Il faudra certainement séparer nettement le No. 610 et le texte du Kj. [Kanjur] des traductions chinoises.” I do not know why this confused Stein, but Lamotte (1962: 15 ) also seems to misrepresent de Jong when he says “Il est hors de doute, dit M. de Jong, que le scribe du No. 610 n’a connu ni la traduction de Dharmatāśīla ni la Mahāvyutpatti.” This is, strictly speaking, true, but not because P. tib. 610 is unrelated to the translation attributed to Dharmatāśīla, but rather because it seems to have perhaps been its antecedant. To be
certain, more study would be welcome, but at least it is de Jong’s conclusion that both P. tib. 610 and 611 are not translations from Chinese.

T. 670: Laṅkāvatāra: See above, with the discussion.
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