

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成30年度
(第22号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2018

Volume XXII

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2019・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism
Soka University
Tokyo・2019

The *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* (ARIRIAB), published annually since 1997, contains papers on a wide range of Buddhist studies, from philological research on Buddhist texts and manuscripts in various languages to studies on Buddhist art and archaeological finds. Also, by publishing and introducing newly-discovered manuscripts and artefacts, we aim to make them available to a wider public so as to foster further research.

Editors-in-chief

Seishi Karashima (IRIAB, Soka University; skarashima@gmail.com)

Noriyuki Kudō (IRIAB, Soka University; nkudo@soka.ac.jp)

Editorial Board

Mark Allon (Sydney)	Xinjiang Rong (Beijing)
Timothy Barrett (London)	Alexander von Rospatt (Berkeley)
Jens Erland Braarvig (Oslo)	Richard Salomon (Seattle)
Jinhua Chen (Vancouver)	Gregory Schopen (Los Angeles)
Bhikkhunī Dhammadinnā (Taiwan)	Francesco Sferra (Naples)
Qing Duan (Beijing)	Weirong Shen (Beijing)
Vincent Eltschinger (Paris)	Jonathan Silk (Leiden)
Harry Falk (Berlin)	Nicholas Sims-Williams (London/Cambridge)
Gérard Fussman (Paris/Strasbourg)	Peter Skilling (Bangkok)
Paul Harrison (Stanford)	Tatsushi Tamai (Tokyo)
Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich)	Katsumi Tanabe (Tokyo)
Oskar von Hinüber (Freiburg)	Vincent Tournier (Paris)
Matthew Kapstein (Paris/Chicago)	Klaus Wille (Göttingen)
Chongfeng Li (Beijing)	Shaoyong Ye (Beijing)
Xuezhu Li (Beijing)	Yutaka Yoshida (Kyoto)
Zhen Liu (Shanghai)	Stefano Zacchetti (Oxford)
Mauro Maggi (Rome)	Peter Zieme (Berlin)
Muhammad Nasim Khan (Peshawar)	Michael Zimmermann (Hamburg)
Irina Fedorovna Popova (St. Petersburg)	Monika Zin (Leipzig)
Juhyung Rhi (Seoul)	

Manuscript submission:

Manuscripts should be submitted by e-mail to the Editors-in-chief both in PDF-format and in Rich-Text-Format (RTF).

*Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
(ARIRIAB)*

at Soka University for the Academic Year 2018

Vol. XXII (2019)

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報
平成30年度（第22号）

CONTENTS

• **RESEARCH ARTICLES:**

Bhikkhu ANĀLAYO: Pārājika Does Not Necessarily Entail Expulsion	3
DHAMMADINNĀ: Soreyya/ā's double sex change: on gender relevance and Buddhist values [4 figures]	9
Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ: “[If some]one says in this connection” The usage of etthāha in Pāli commentarial literature	35
Katarzyna MARCINIAK: <i>Editio princeps</i> versus an old palm-leaf manuscript Sa: Verses in the <i>Mahāvastu</i> revisited (II)	59
Seishi KARASHIMA and Katarzyna MARCINIAK: <i>Sabhika-vastu</i>	71
Seishi KARASHIMA and Katarzyna MARCINIAK: The story of Hastinī in the <i>Mahāvastu</i> and <i>Fobenxingji jing</i>	103
Peter SKILLING and SAERJI: Jātakas in the <i>Bhadrakalpika-sūtra</i> : A provisional inventory I	125
James B. APPLE: The Semantic Elucidation (nirukta) of Bodhisattva Spiritual Attainment: A Rhetorical Technique in Early Mahāyāna Sūtras	171
LIU Zhen: An Improved Critical Edition of <i>Maitreyavyākaraṇa</i> in Gilgit Manuscript	193
LU Lu: An Analogy of Pots in <i>Dao di jing</i> 道地經 and its Sanskrit Parallel	209
Péter-Dániel SZÁNTÓ: A Fragment of the <i>Prasannapadā</i> in the Bodleian Library [2 figures]	213
LI Xuezhū: Diplomatic Transcription of the Sanskrit Manuscript of the <i>Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā</i>	217
Jonathan A. SILK: Chinese Sūtras in Tibetan Translation: A Preliminary Survey	227
Mauro MAGGI: Bits and bites: the Berlin fragment bi 43 and Khotanese * <i>druṣ-</i> [2 figures]	247
Yutaka YOSHIDA: On the Sogdian articles	261
Tatsushi TAMAI: The Tocharian <i>Maitreyasamitināṭaka</i>	287
Peter ZIEME: A fragment of an Old Uighur translation of the <i>Śatapañcāśatka</i> [2 figures]	333
Isao KURITA: The Great Passing of the Buddha and Māra [7 figures]	345

M. Nasim KHAN:	
Studying Buddhist Sculptures in Context (I):	347
The Case of a Buddha Figure from But Kara III, Gandhāra [20 figures]	
Tadashi TANABE:	
Gandhāran Śibi-Jātaka Imagery and Falconry —Gandhāra, Kizil and Dunhuang— [20 figures]	359
Haiyan Hu-von HINÜBER:	
From the Upper Indus to the East Coast of China:	377
On the Origin of the Pictorial Representation of the Lotus Sūtra [8 figures]	

• **EDITORIALS:**

Contributors to this Issue

New Publications:

Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India, vol. II.2. *Mahāyāna Texts: Prajñāpāramitā Texts* (2).

Ed. by Seishi KARASHIMA and Tatsushi TAMAI.

The *Mahāvastu*. A New Edition. Vol. III

Ed. by Katarzyna MARCINIAK. *BIBLIOTHECA PHILOLOGICA ET PHILOSOPHICA BUDDHICA* vol. XIV, 1.

Contents of Back Issues [ARIRIAB, BPPB, BLSF, StPSF, GMNAI]

• **PLATES**

DHAMMADINNĀ: Soreyya/ā's double sex change	PLATES	1–2
P. SZÁNTÓ: A Fragment of the <i>Prasannapadā</i> in the Bodleian Library	PLATE	3
M. MAGGI: Bits and bites: the Berlin fragment bi 43 and Khotanese * <i>druṣ-</i>	PLATES	4–5
P. ZIEME: A fragment of an Old Uighur translation of the <i>Śatapāñcāśatka</i>	PLATE	6
I. KURITA: The Great Passing of the Buddha and Māra	PLATES	7–9
M. Nasim KHAN: Studying Buddhist Sculptures in Context (I)	PLATES	10–16
T. TANABE: Gandhāran Śibi-Jātaka Imagery and Falconry	PLATES	17–22
Haiyan Hu-VON HINÜBER: From the Upper Indus to the East Coast of China	PLATES	23–24

2019年3月31日発行

編集主幹 辛嶋静志・工藤順之

発行所 創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所

〒192-8577 東京都八王子市丹木町 1-236, Tel: 042-691-2695, Fax: 042-691-4814

E-mail: iriab@soka.ac.jp; URL: <http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/>

印刷所 清水工房

〒192-0056 東京都八王子市追分町 10-4-101, Tel: 042-620-2626, Fax: 042-620-2616

Published on 31 March 2019

Editors-in-Chief: Seishi KARASHIMA and Noriyuki KUDO

Published by The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University

1-236 Tangi, Hachioji, Tokyo 192-8577, JAPAN

Phone: +81-42-691-2695 / Fax: +81-42-691-4814; E-mail: iriab@soka.ac.jp; URL: <http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/>

Printed by Simizukobo, Co.Ltd., Hachioji, Tokyo, JAPAN

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

Tibetan translations; Chinese sūtras; Dunhuang; China–Tibet relations

All translation is commentary.¹ 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.

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* 大唐内典录, the *Lidai zhongjingjian ruzang lu* 歷代衆經見入藏录, 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. Note that for 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 *Maitreyapariṣcchā* and *Gaṅgottarāpariṣcchā*. 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 *Sukhāvāṭīvyūha 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 *Sukhāvāṭīvyūha sūtra*, rendered from Bodhiruci’s *Wuliangshou rulai hui* 無量壽如來會 (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.

slightly), and for Bu ston's catalogue Nishioka 1980, 1981, 1983.⁵ 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,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 Mahāratnakūṭa 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 Mahāratnakūṭa 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 Mahāratnakūṭa 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 Mahāratnakūṭa 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 Mahāratnakūṭa

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 gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod ces bya ba*.

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 situation 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 Mahāratnakūṭa 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).⁷ 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:

- Apple: Apple and Apple 2017, numbering of titles in P. tib. 1257.
- Bu ston: Bu ston's catalogue, edition Nishioka 1980, 1981, 1983
- Lhan dkar ma: edition Herrmann-Pfandt 2008
- 'Phang thang ma: edition Kawagoe 2005 (cp. Halkias 2004)
- 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 bcaḍ 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'i chos 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 *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 (T. 2034 [XLIX] 103a21; see Chavannes 1905: 353 for a translation) reference to Jñānagupta's having seen a **Ratnakūṭa* (*Baoji* 寶積) in what may be Karghalik (Zhejujia 遮拘迦), in Central Asia, which for Sakurabe places the Mahāratnakūṭa 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 *Ratnakūṭa par excellence*, all the more so as immediately following in the list comes *Lengjia* 楞伽, that is, the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*. In Indian sources without exception *Ratnakūṭa* refers only to what we commonly know as the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, one of the 49 texts of what is now the Mahāratnakūṭa 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 phāng byan phhur po'u in kyeng su phim de'i ir* (for variants see Tauscher 2008: 46n124). This is a transliteration not only of *Dāfāngbiàn fóbàoēn jīng* 大方便佛報恩經, but also of the following reference to the first section of the text, *xùpīn* 序品 (*su phim*), and *dīyī* 第一 (*de'i ir*).

- T. 171: **Sudāna-sūtra / Jinaputrārthasiddhi: Taizi Xudana jing* 太子須大拏經 [T. 152 (14) *Xudana jing* 須大拏經 ([III] 7c27–11a26)] (Shengjian 聖堅) = D 351, P 1020: *Rgyal bu don grub kyi mdo*. IOL Tib J 76. Lhan dkar ma 264, 'Phang thang ma 727. Bu ston 65. DNSV colophon: sngon rgya las 'gyur ba'i brda rnying par 'dug. Galambos and van Schaik 2015. Chinese translated in Chavannes 1911: 362–395.
- T. 202: *Xianyu jing* 賢愚經 (Huijue 慧覺 and others) = D 341, P 1008: *Mdzangs blun zhes bya ba'i mdo*. Lhan dkar ma 250, 'Phang thang ma 230. Bu ston 75: 'Gos Chos grub kyis rgya gar dang rgya'i dpe las bsgyur ba. D colophon: rgya nag las 'gyur bar snang ngo. Apple 63, spelt 'dzangs blun. Among a large literature: Takakusu 1901; Mair 1993. Dunhuang mss edited in Terjék 1969, 1970, Ueyama 1990: 124–126.
- T. 273: *Vajrasamādhi: Jingang sanmei jing* 金剛三昧經 = D 135, P 803: *Rdo rje'i ting nge 'dzin gyi chos kyi rnam grangs yi ge*. P. tib. 623, incipit: *rdo rje ting nge 'dzin chos gyi yi ge'i le'u gcig ste mgon nan gyi le'u'o* (van Schaik 2014: 62, §25). Lhan dkar 254, 'Phang thang ma 233. Bu ston 220: rgya las bsgyur ba. Stein 1983: 13n23 refers to P. tib. 623. Takasaki 1986. English translation of Chinese in Buswell 1989: 185–251. According to van Schaik, the Dunhuang manuscript “is similar to the canonical edition, except for the presence in the manuscript of archaicisms [*sic*] such as the *da drag* and *a rten*.”
- T. 310 (5): *Sukhāvātīvyūha: Wuliangshou rulai hui* 無量壽如來會 (Bodhiruci) = 'Od dpag med kyi bkod pa. Akamatsu 1984b. P. tib. 557, 563, 562, 561, 556, 96, 564. Edition J. Silk in preparation. Partial English translation of Chinese in Chang et al. 1983: 339–359.
- T. 310 (7): *Varmavyūhanirdeśa: Beijia zhuangyan hui* 被甲莊嚴會 (Bodhiruci) = D 51: *Go cha'i bkod pa bstan pa*. NS colophon: lo tstsha ba mgos Chos grub kyis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur pa'o. Lhan dkar ma 31, 'Phang thang ma 685. Sakurabe 1930: 151; Ueyama 1990: 126–129.
- T. 310 (13): *Āyusman-nanda-garbhāvākṛāntinirdeśa: Fowei A'nan shuo chutai hui* 佛爲阿難說處胎會 (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 Chos 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. 310 (14): *Nanda-garbhāvākṛāntinirdeśa: Foshuo rutaizang hui* 佛說入胎藏會 (Yijing 義淨) = D 57: *Dga' bo mngal na gnas pa bstan pa*. See above T. 310 (13). NST colophon: Gcung mo'u dga'bo. Lhan dkar ma 37, 'Phang thang ma 684. Sakurabe 1930: 154. For Ueyama 1990: 129 (2) there is a strong chance that this is due to Chos grub. Kritzer 2012; 2014.
- T. 310 (17): *Pūrṇaparipṛcchā: Fulouna hui* 富樓那會 (attributed to Kumārajīva) = D 61: *Gang pos zhus pa*. Lhan dkar ma 41, 'Phang thang ma 713. Sakurabe 1930: 155; for Sakurabe 1930–1932: 243n, it is undoubtedly translated from Kumārajīva's translation; for Ueyama 1990: 129 (2) there is a strong chance that this is due to Chos grub. Mitsukawa 1988.
- T. 310 (20): **Vidyutprātaparipṛcchā* [so D, but perhaps erroneously for *Vidyutprapāta*°?]: *Wujin fuzang hui* 無盡伏藏會 (Bodhiruci) = D 64: *Glog thob kyis zhus pa*. End title in ST: *Mi zad pa'i gter bstan pa'i le'u*. Lhan dkar ma 44: *glog/klog sbyin gyis zhus pa*. 'Phang thang ma 714: *klog gi dbyig gis zhus pa'i mdo*. Sakurabe 1930–1932: 244n, from Chinese? Sakurabe 1930: 156–157; for Ueyama 1990: 129 (2), there is a strong chance that this is due to Chos grub. Partial English translation of Chinese in Chang et al. 1983: 149–163.
- T. 310 (31): *Gaṅgotarāparipṛcchā: Gengheshang youpoyi hui* 恒河上優婆夷會 (Bodhiruci) = P. tib. 89: *Dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog gi 'dus pa*. Edition J. Silk to be published. English translation of Chinese in Chang et al. 1983: 37–40. [Cp. D 75: *Gang gā'i mchog gis zhus pa*: Jinamitra, Dānaśīla and Ye shes sde: Lhan dkar ma 55.]
- T. 310 (40): *Dārikāvimalaśraddhāparipṛcchā: Jingxin tongnü hui* 淨信童女會 (Bodhiruci) = D 84 *Bu mo rnam dag dad pas zhus pa*. NST: lo tstsha ba 'gos Chos grub kyis rgya nag gi dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te | gtan la phab pa. Lhan dkar ma 64, 'Phang thang ma 185: *bu mo dad ldan gyis zhus pa*. Sakurabe 1930: 164; Ueyama 1990: 126–129.
- T. 310 (42): *Maitreyaparipṛcchā: Mile pusa suowen hui* 彌勒菩薩所問會 (Bodhiruci) = P. tib. 89: *Byangs chub sems dpa' byams pas zhus pa'i 'dus pa*. Apple 55: *'Phags pa byams pas dris pha'i mdo*. Li 2016, and edition in preparation by Channa Li. [Cp. D 86: *Byams pas zhus pa*: Jinamitra, Dānaśīla and Ye shes sde; Lhan dkar ma 66: *byams pas zhus pa'i chos brgyad pa*.]
- T. 366: *Amituo jing* 阿彌陀經 (Kumārajīva) = *Snang ba mtha' yas kyī mdo*. P. tib. 758. Transcription of Chinese text in Tibetan script (IOL Tib J 1405–1411) in Takata 1988: 254–261. Apple 42: *snang ba mtha' yas kyī mdo*. Akamatsu 1984a; edition J. Silk to be published.
- T. 374: *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra: Da panniepan jing* 大般涅槃經 (Dharma-kṣema) = 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 gzhi '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: *Daśacakraṣṭigarbha: Dasheng daji dizang shilun jing* 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 / 大方廣十輪經. S 71 colophon: bande Rnam par mi rtog pas rgya las bsgyur ba'o | mdo 'dir skad gsar bcad kyis gtan la ma phab pa'i 'gyur rnying pa 'ga' zhiig gda'o. Lhan dkar ma 82, 'Phang thang ma 40.
- T. 452: *Foshuo guan Mile pusa shangsheng doushuaitian jing* 佛說觀彌勒菩薩上生兜率天經 (attributed wrongly to Juqu Jingsheng 沮渠京聲; this is rather a Central Asian composition than a translation as such) = D 199: *Byang chub sems dpa' byams pa dga'ldan gnam du skye ba blangs pa'i mdo*. DSV colophon: zhu ba'i lo tsā ba bande Pab tong [S ban dhe ye pab stong; V ban de pab 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. 482: *Lokadharaparipṛcchā: Chishi jing* 持世經 (Kumārajīva) = D 174, P 841: 'phags pa 'jig rten 'dzin gyis yongs su dris pa zhes bya ba'i mdo. Sakurabe 1930–1932: 321: translation from Kumārajīva's version.
- T. 653: *Fozang jing* 佛藏經 (attributed to Kumārajīva) = D 123, P 791: *Sangs rgyas mdzod kyī chos kyī yi ge* || ming gcig ni chos so cog las gdams. N calls it *Buddhadharmakośakāra*. Lhan dkar ma 255, 'Phang thang ma 234. Apple 15: *sangs rgyas kyī mdzod*. Bu ston 199: rgya las bsgyur ba. Mitsukawa 1988. [Cp. *Buddhapiṭakaduḥśīlanigrahī*: D 220, P 886.]
- T. 665: *Suvarṇabhāsottama: Jin guangming zuishengwang jing* 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 kyī 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.
- T. 670: *Lankāvatāra: Lengjia abaduoluo baojing* 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經 (Guṇabhadra) = D 108, P 776: *Lang kar gshegs pa rin po che'i mdo las sangs rgyas thams cad kyī gsung gi snying po'i le'u*. D colophon: dpal lha btsan po'i bka' lung gis rgya'i slob dpon Wen hī yis

mdzad pa'i 'grel pa dang sbyar nas | lo tsā ba dge slong 'gos Chos grub kyis bsgyur cing zhus. Lhan dkar ma 252. Takasaki 1978; Ueyama 1990: 112–117.

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 kyī ring lugs pa 'gos Chos grub kyis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur te gtan la phab pa'o.

- T. 685: *Foshuo yulanpen jing* 佛說盂蘭盆經 = S 266, T 266, V 314: *Yongs su skyob pa'i snod ces bya ba'i mdo*. SV colophon: zhu chen gyi lo tsa [V tstsha] ba dge slong [V 'gos] Chos grub kyis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa'o. Edition (of S), translation and study Kapstein 2007; translation of S in Berounský 2012: 116–120.
- T. 784: *Sishi'erzhang jing* 四十二章經 = D 359a (*mdo sde*, aḥ 281b1–289a3): *h.pho bsho* [= 佛說] *zi shī il tāng kying*, *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 zhing rgya'i bka' 'gyur na bzhugs pa las gnam skyong gong ma'i bkas manydzu'i skad du bsgyur zhing bod skad du bka' bcu su b.ha ga shre ya d.hwā dza dang dka' [> bka'] bcu d.hyā nā ri ṣṭam byā sa gnyis gyi bsgyur | sog skad du rab 'byams pa pra dznyo da ya byā sas bsgyur ba | rgyal bstan la lhang par dad pa'i sbyin bdag hīng līn gyis chos sbyin rgya cher spel ba'i phyir dngul srang brgyas skad bzhi shan sbyar ba'i spar bsgrubs te ci lcogs shig spyar nas zhing mchog dam par gyur pa rnam la phul ba'i dge ba'i rtsa bas rgyal bstan rin po che dar zhing rgyas la yun ring du gnas ba dang 'jig rten khamsu nad dang mu ge 'khrugs rtsod nam yang mi 'dung zhing 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. 785: *Dedao tideng xizhang jing* 得道梯橙錫杖經 (Anonymous trans.) = D 335, P. 1001: 'Khar gsil gyi mdo. Along with D 336, P. 1002: 'Khar gsil 'chang pa'i kun tu spyod pa'i cho ga. No translator identified. However, in IOL J Tib. 205 we find: khar sil gyi mdo || cho ga 'di zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba ban de Chos grub kyis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te | gtan la phab pa ||. Ueyama 1990: 141–142.
- T. 794: *Shifeishi jing* 時非時經 (Ruoluoyan 若羅嚴) = IOL J Tib 213: *Dus dang dus ma yin pa bstan pa*. Colophon: zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang | lo ca ba bcom ldan 'das kyī ring lugs ban de Chos grub gyis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te | gtan la phab pa ||. Chinese and Tibetan edition, with Japanese translation, in Ueyama 1990: 129–140.
- T. 945: **Śūraṅgama Sūtra: Da foding rulai miyin xiuzheng liaoyi zhupusa wanxing shoulengyan jing* 大佛頂如來密因修證了義諸菩薩萬行首楞嚴經 (Bancimidi 般刺蜜帝) = D 237, P 903: *Gtsug gtor chen po bam po dgu pa la bdud kyī le'u nyi tshē phyung ba*. Lhan dkar ma 260, 'Phang thang ma 238. DS colophon: sngon gyi dkar chag gsum du rgya nag las 'gyur bar bshad do. Bu ston 319: rgya las bsgyur ba. Staël-Holstein 1936. Chinese translated into English several times. See also Benn 2008.
- T. 998: *Pariṇatacakra* [or: *Pariṇāmacakra*]: *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*

theg pa chen po'i mdo. Lhan dkar ma 262, 'Phang thang ma 236 (or 720?). Bu ston 323: rgya las bsgyur ba rnam par mi rtog pa'i 'gyur. D colophon: li'i dge slong sde snod gsum dang ldan pa Shī la dharmasa | rgya gar gyi dharmā rgya'i ye ge las bande Rnam par mi rtog gis bsgyur ba. Bathang 148 (Eimer 2012: 103) colophon: zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba ban de Chos grub kyi rgya dpal [> dpe] las bsgyur cing gtan la phab pa. Saerji 2010. See below under *Samādhicakra*.

- T. 1060: *Qianshou qianyan guanshiyin pusa guangda yuanman wuai dabeixin tuoluoni jing* 千手千眼觀世音菩薩廣大圓滿無礙大悲心陀羅尼經 (Jiafandamo 伽梵達摩) = D 691 & 897, P 369 & 522: *Byang chub sems dpa' spyan ras gzigs dbang phyug phyag stong spyan stong dang ldan pa thogs pa mi mnga' ba'i thugs rje chen po'i sems rgya cher yongs su rdzogs pa zhes bya ba'i gzungs*. S 645 colophon: zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba ban dhe Chos grub kyi rgya'i dpe las bsgyur te gtan la phab pa. IOL Tib J 214, 453, 513, P. tib. 43, 49, 356, 420, 421. Dalton and van Schaik 2006: 29; Ueyama 1990: 142–146. See Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 186–188.
- T. 1071: *Mukhadaśaikavidyāmantrahr̥daya: Shiyimian shenzhou xinjing* 十一面神咒心經 (Xuanzang) = D 694, P 374: *Zhal bcu gcig pa'i rig sngags kyi snying po zhes bya ba'i gzungs*. S 643 colophon: zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs pa ban dhe Chos grub kyi rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa. Ueyama 1990: 147–148.
- T. 1082: *Guanshiyin pusa mimizang ruyilun tuoluoni shenzhou jing* 觀世音菩薩祕密藏如意輪陀羅尼神咒經 (Śikṣānanda 實叉難陀) = D 692, P 370: *Spyan ras gzigs dbang phyug gi gsang ba'i mdzod thogs pa med pa'i yid bzhin gyi 'khor lo'i snying po zhes bya ba'i gzungs*. S 647 colophon: zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang lo tsa ba bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs pa ban dhe Chos grub kyi rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa'o. Ueyama 1990: 146–147.
- T. 1484: *Fanwang jing* 梵網經 = *Brahmajāla*: D 256, P 922: *Chos kyi rgya mo sangs rgyas rnam par snang mdzad kyi byang chub sems dpa'i sems kyi gnas bshad pa le'u bcu*. Lhan dkar ma 261B, 'Phang thang ma 237. Apple 21: *tshangs lha dra pa*, a word-for-word translation of 梵網 (cf. T. 21, below under 'Questionable Cases'). Bu ston 337: rgya las 'gyur ba. A translation of the second *juan* (the older portion) of the Chinese text. Tokiya 1990; Maeda 1992. Chinese translated into English several times.
- T. 2871: *Datong fanguang chanhui miezui zhuangyan chengfo jing* 大通方廣懺悔滅罪莊嚴成佛經 = D 264, P 930: *Thar pa chen po phyogs su rgyas pa 'gyod tshangs kyi sdig sbyangs te sangs rgyas su grub par rnam par bkod pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*. Lhan dkar ma 258 (cp. 149), 'Phang thang ma 235. Bu ston 345: rgya las 'gyur ba. D colophon: rgya nag gi 'gyur shlau ka bdun brgya rtsa bcu gnyis ta bam po gnyis dang shlau ka brgya bcu gnyis. Róna-Tas 1971. Stein 1983: 13n23 refers to P. tib. 92 as a translation “in Chinese vocabulary.” See also IOL Tib J 207, La Vallée Poussin 1962. Dan Martin (in his 21 April 2014 version of his *TibSkr̥it* bibliography, s.v. Mahāmokṣa Sūtra; repeated without clear attribution to Martin by Apple 2014: 34n28) draws attention to a

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 || || rgya 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 dregs la bcos 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 zhing | 'gyur khyad par dbang gis 'di dang 'di'i rigs mthun ji snyed rang cag las rnam dpyod mi dman pa'i sngon byon mkhas grub chos spyang ldan pa rnam gyis mdo yang dag tu bzhed nas gsung rab rin po che'i khrod du bzhugs su gsol ba yin pas chos spong mtshams med kyi las mi gsog cing bag yod par bya | 'di spar du sgrub skabs kyang khams bod kyi bka' 'gyur spar ma thams cad dang | khyad par gangs ljongs rgyal khab chen po'i ma phyi chen mo sogs dpe khungs btsun du ma dang bsdur zhing dag par bgyis pa yin pas kun gyis yid brtan rung par yod do ||. Chinese studied in Makita 1976: 290–303.

- T. 2881: *Shan'e yinguo jing* 善惡因果經 = D 354, P 1023: *Legs nyes kyi rgyu dang 'bras bu bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*. D colophon: zhu chen gyi lo tsā ba bande Chos grub kyi rgya gar dang rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa. IOT J 220, 221, 298, 335.2–3. Likewise D 355, P 1024: *Dge ba dang mi dge ba'i las kyi rnam par smin pa bstan pa'i mdo*. According to Ren 2012, which contains editions of the text, D 354 by Chos grub probably knew the earlier translation D 355 of Mchims Śākya 'od, both based on the same Chinese original. However, this needs reconsideration, according to Channa Li. Makita 1976: 336–344; Ueyama 1990: 119–121.
- 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 rmying pa skad gsar gyis 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 (and reproduction of the manuscript) from P. tib. 2105 in Lalou 1961; edition of Chinese in Okimoto 1978, 1998: 278–330; According to Stein 1983: 9, 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 meng pab ha'i gyis | chos rgyal gyi mdo 'di | mjug chad pa rgya'i gpe [> dpe] las bsgyur pa'o*, understood by Okimoto to mean (transcribed) “河西管内都僧錄<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.]

T. 2897: *Tiandi bayang shenzhou jing* 天地八陽神咒經 = D 1067, P 693: *Sangs rgyas kyi chos gsal zhing yangs pa snang brgyad ces bya ba'i mdo*. Bu ston 1287: snang brgyad ces bya ba'i rig sngags li las bsgyur ba 'di 'phang thang mar bka' yang dag tu mdzad mod kyi brtag pa'i gshi'o. In the source of this, however, 'Phang thang ma 733 itself, we find: snang brgyad ces bya ba'i rig sngags, followed by (in reference to this and 732): mdo dang gzungs 'di nmams rgya dang li las bsgyur. See Kawagoe 2005: 36nn152–152. Oda 2015a: 57–58 divides the Dunhuang Tibetan renderings into three groups: Old (P. tib. 746, 747, 749), New (P. tib. 743, 745, 729, 2100, 744 + IOL J 416 [? 461?] + IOL J 462, IOL J 459 + P. tib. 106 + IOL J 416, IOL J 458, 460, 463, P. tib. 454 + IOL J 461), and Later (P. tib. 2206, 742, 730, 748), discussing examples in the following pages. P. tib. 1258 is transcribed by Takata 1988: 270–282, with remarks 29–31. P. tib. 743 and 745 have the title as follows: *rgya gar gyi skad du Par yong shin ji'u* [or: *dzu*] *khyed* [or: *khyang*] || *bod skad du 'Phags pa snang brgyad ces bya ba'* || *thag pa cen po 'i mdo* ||. Quoted from Nishioka 1981, an essential study; see also Oda 1986; 2015b; Stein 1983: 90–92, and passim. Edited in Tibetan and translated in German by Weber and Huth 1891 (sic!); studied by Eimer 2002; Dalton and van Schaik 2006: 205–208. On the history briefly see Oda 1983: 71–72; 2001; Kimura 1997. The Kanjur text is roughly one quarter the extent of the Dunhuang text.

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

Zuimiao shengding jing 最妙勝定經 = *'Phags pa ting nge 'dzin mchog dam pa zhes bya ba'i mdo*. D 137, P 805. P. tib. 102, IOL Tib J 198. The Chinese is edited in Izaki 1998, earlier in Fang 1995: 338–348, yet earlier by Sekiguchi 1969: 379–395 (originally 1950). Magin 2002 translated the Chinese with a lengthy introduction. Greene 2012: 240n115 (repeatedly mis-ordering the elements in the Chinese title) suggests the scripture's title be understood as “Scripture on the Supreme Excellency of Meditation,” rather than “Scripture on Most Supremely Excellent Meditation,” but the Tibetan translation supports the latter. Note that a manuscript in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences (Дх. Тиб. 217; Zorin 2018, who also identifies P. tib. 720 and 900 as the same text), differs somewhat. Zorin 2018: 33 speculates that perhaps “Дх. Тиб. 217 has preserved for us an ancient version of the Tibetan translation of the [sūtra].”

Chinese Not Yet Identified:

Atajñāna: D 122, P 790: *'Da' kha ye shes zhes bya ba theg pa chen po 'i mdo*. Lhan dkar ma 270. Bu ston 198: rgya las 'gyur ba. SV (Shey) colophon: dkar chag rnying par rgya las 'gyur bar bshad. Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 149: “Dieser Text is im chinesischen Original verlorengegangen, findet sich aber noch in der tibetischen Übersetzung, die von Länge

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

Dharmasamudra: D 255, P 921: *Theg pa chen po'i mdo chos rgya mtsho* zhes bya ba: DSV colophon: rgya las 'gyur ba skad gsar bcad kyis gtan la phab pa'o.

Buddhānusmṛtisamādhisamudra: L 97, S 130, T 131, V 180, Shey 161, Gondhla 30.09: *Sangs rgyas rjes su dran pa'i ting nge 'dzin gyi rgya mtsho*: S, Shey colophon: mdo 'di sngon rgya las 'gyur ba'i mjug ma rdzogs pa sgyur 'phro lus par snang ste mkhas pas legs par gzigs 'tshal. See Tauscher 2008: xvi.

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 pusa wen fashen jing* 佛說寶積三昧文殊師利菩薩問法身經 and T. 355 *Rufajie tixing jing* 入法界體性經 and to D 118, P. 786, *Rin po che'i mtha'*, *Ratnakoti*, and provides a collated edition of all versions of this text and the *Pariṇāmacakra*, with the Tibetan drawn from D.

Samyagācāravṛttagaganavarṇavinayakṣānti: D 263, P 929: *Yang dag par spyod pa'i tshul nam mkha'i mdog gis 'dul ba'i bzod pa*. SV colophon: rgya las 'gyur | 'gyur rnying pa skad gsar cad kyis bcas par snang ngo. Bu ston 342: rgya las 'gyur ba.

Questionable cases:

T. 21: *Fanwang liushierjian jing* 梵網六十二見經 / T. 1 (21): *Brahmajāla-sūtra: Fandong jing* 梵動經 (*Chang ahan jing* 長阿含經 21) = D 352 *Tshangs pa'i dra ba'i mdo*. Lhan dkar ma 261A credits the translation to Ye shes sde (cp. 'Phang thang ma 248). Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 144 comments “Vermutlich ist dies keine Übersetzung aus dem Chinesischen.” Cf. above T. 1484, with which there might be a confusion.

T. 310 (11): *Rāsmisamantamukta-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 bcu gcig 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 ti 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 yanming 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 nyi '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 nyi 'od*, Schaeffer and van der Kuijp 2009: 11.15. See 'Phang thang ma 262, Bu ston 52.

Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra: D 248, P 914: *Byang chub sems dpa'i so sor thar ba chos bzhi sgrub pa*. If the text is properly identified, Lhan dkar ma 259 wrongly classifies it, as does the *Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi '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.

Maitreyavyākaraṇa: P 1011, N 329: *Byams pa lung bstan pa*. Lhan dkar ma 265B, 'Phang thang ma 273. N colophon: rgya gar gyi mkhan po Dzi na mi tra dang | lotstsha ba ban dhe Dpal brtsegs rakṣi tas bsgyur.

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*.

Upāyakauśalya. 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 竺法護) = 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: *Upāyakauśalyajñānottarabodhisattvapariṣcchā*: 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.

Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: P. tib. 610 and 611 contain fragments of a Tibetan translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*. 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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*. Il est possible qu'il s'agit d'une recension primitive de la traduction de Dharmatāśīla revue plus tard après la compilation de la *Mahāvvyutpatti*. 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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*.” 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 antecedent. 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.

Literature

- Akamatsu Kōshō 赤松孝章. 1984a. “Chibetto-yaku Amidakyō no ihon: Tonkō shahon P tib 758 ni tsuite” チベット訳阿弥陀経の異本: 敦煌写本 P tib 七五八について [A variant Tibetan version of the Smaller Sukhāvātīvyūha: Dunhuang manuscript P. tib 758]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 33/1: 150–151.
- . 1984b. “Chibetto-yaku Muryōjūkyō no Tonkō shinshutsu iyakuhon” チベット訳無量寿経の敦煌新出異訳本 [A variant Tibetan translation of the Larger Sukhāvātīvyūha from Dunhuang]. *Ryūkoku Daigaku Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 龍谷大學佛教文化研究所紀要 23: 2–7. [One portion of a series of studies, edited Ueyama Daishun 上山大峻, “Ryūkoku Daigaku-zō Chibetto-go Bunken no Kenkyū (II)” 龍谷大学蔵チベット語文献の研究 (II), Tibetan literature preserved in Ryūkoku University collections.]
- . 1988. “Tonkō shahon—P.tib.1257—ni mirareru kyōron risuto ni tsuite” 敦煌写本—P.tib.1257—に見られる経論リストについて [A List of Buddhist Texts Found in the Tun-huang Manuscript, P. tib. 1257]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 37/1: 379–377 (134–136).
- Apple, James B. 2014. “The Phrase *dharmaparyāyo hastagato* in Mahāyāna Buddhist Literature: Rethinking the Cult of the Book in Middle Period Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 134/1: 25–50.
- Apple, James B. and Shinobu A. Apple. 2017. “A Re-evaluation of Pelliot tibétain 1257: An Early Tibetan-Chinese Glossary from Dunhuang.” *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 42: 68–180.
- Arai, Keiyo. 2005. “The Sutra on the Profundity of Filial Love.” In J.C. Cleary, et al., *Apocryphal Scriptures*. BDK English Tripiṭaka (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research): 129–139.
- Arakawa Mana 荒川真菜. 2009. “*Daihatsunehangyō ni okeru Ajaseō: Zōkanyaku ‘Bongyōhon’ o chūshin*” 『大般涅槃経』における阿闍世王: 蔵漢訳【梵行品】を中心に. MA thesis, Ryukoku University. [Not seen]
- Benn, James A. 2008. “Another Look at the Pseudo-*Śūraṅgama sūtra*.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 68/1: 57–89.
- Berounský, Daniel. 2012. *The Tibetan Version of the Scripture on the Ten Kings, and the quest for Chinese influence on the Tibetan perception of the afterlife* (Prague: Triton, Faculty of Arts, Charles University).
- Buswell, Robert E., Jr. 1989. *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamādhi-sūtra, A Buddhist Apocryphon* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Chang, Garma C.C., et al. 1983. *A Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras: Selections from the Mahāratnakūṭa Sūtra* (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press).
- Chavannes, Édouard. 1905. “Jinagupta (528–605 après J.-C.).” *T'oung Pao* 6/3: 332–356.
- . 1911. *Cinq Cents Contes et Apologues extraits du Tripiṭaka chinois et traduits en Français*. Tome III (Paris: Ernest Leroux).
- Dalton, Jacob, and Sam van Schaik. 2006. *Tibetan Tantric Manuscripts from Dunhuang: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Stein Collection at the British Library*. Brill's Tibetan Studies Library 12 (Leiden: Brill).
- Du Doucheng 杜斗城. 1989. *Dunhuangben Foshuo shiwangjing jiaolu yanjiu* 敦煌本《佛说十王经》校录研究 (Lanzhou: Gansu jiaoyu chubanshe 甘肃教育出版社). [Not seen]
- Eimer, Helmut. 2002. “Das Sūtra der ‘Acht Erscheinungen’: Bemerkungen zu den tibetischen Versionen.” In W. Gantke, K. Hoheisel and W. Klein, eds., *Religionsbegegnung und Kulturaustausch in Asien: Studien zum Gedenken an Hans-Joachim Klimkeit*. Studies in Oriental Religions 49 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz): 63–71.
- . 2012. *A Catalogue of the Kanjur Fragment from Bathang Kept in the Newark Museum*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 75 (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien).
- Elverskog, Johan. 2006. “The Mongolian Big Dipper Sūtra.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 29/1: 87–123.
- Fang Guangchang 方廣鎬, ed. 1995. *Zangwai fojiao wenxian* 藏外佛教文獻 1 (Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe 宗教文化出版社).
- Feer, Henri Léon. 1868. *Le Sūtra en Quarante-deux Articles. Textes Chinois, Tibétain et Mongol ... d'après l'Exemplaire polyglotte rapporté par l'abbé Huc* (Paris: Maisonneuve et C^{ie}).

- Franke, Herbert. 1990. "The Taoist elements in the Buddhist Great Bear Sūtra (Pei-tou ching)." *Asia Major* 3/1: 75–111.
- Fujita Kōkan 藤田光寛. 1988. "'Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra' ni tsuite" <Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra>について [On the Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra]. *Mikkyō Bunka* 密教文化 163: 132–117 (1–35).
- Galambos, Imre, and Sam van Schaik. 2015. "The Valley of Dantig and the myth of exile and return." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 78/3: 475–491.
- Greene, Eric Matthew. 2012. *Meditation, Repentance, and Visionary Experience in Early Medieval Chinese Buddhism*. PhD thesis, UC Berkeley.
- Hakamaya, Noriaki. 1984. "The Old and New Translations of the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*: Some Notes on the History of the Early Tibetan Translations." *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 駒澤大学仏教学部研究紀要 42: 192–176 (1–17).
- Halkias, Georgios T. 2004. "Tibetan Buddhism Registered: A Catalogue from the Imperial Court of 'Phang Thang." *Eastern Buddhist* 36: 46–105.
- Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid. 2008. *Die lHan kar ma: ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte*. Kritische Neuausgabe mit Einleitung und Materialien (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften).
- Izaki Naomichi 猪崎直道. 1998. "Saimyōshōjōkyō-kō" 『最妙勝定經』考 [On the Doctrines of the apocryphal sūtra *Zuimiao sheng ding jing*]. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu Ronshū* 駒澤大学仏教学部論集 29: 312–328.
- de Jong, J. W. 1955. "Fonds Pelliot tibétain Nos. 610 et 611." In Nagao Gajin 長尾雅人 and Nozawa Jōshō 野澤靜澄, eds., *Yamaguchi Hakase Kanreki Kinen: Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Ronsō* 山口博士還暦記念・印度学仏教学論叢 / *Studies in Indology and Buddhology: Presented in Honour of Professor Susumu Yamaguchi on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館): 59–67.
- . 1968–1969. "Encore une fois le fonds Pelliot tibétain No. 610." *Central Asiatic Journal* 12: 1–7.
- . 1979. Review of Oetke 1977. *Indo Iranian Journal* 21: 300–304.
- Kapstein, Matthew. 2007. "The Tibetan Yulanpen jing." In Matthew Kapstein and Brandon Dotson, eds., *Contributions to the Cultural History of Early Tibet*. Brill's Tibetan Studies Library 14 (Leiden: Brill): 209–238.
- Kawagoe Eishin 川越英真. 2005. *Dkar chag 'Phang thang ma* (Sendai: Tōhoku Indo-Chibetto Kenkyūkai 東北インド・チベット研究会).
- Kimura Kiyotaka 木村清孝. 1997. "Gikyō Hachiyōkyō no seiritsu to hen'yō" 「偽經『八陽經』の成立と變容」 [Establishment and transformation of the Apocryphal Buddhist Text *Bayang jing*]. In *Tōhō Gakkai sōritsu gojūnen shūnen kinen Tōhōgaku ronshū* 東方學會創立五十周年記念東方學論集. Tokyo: Tōhō Gakkai 東方學會: 473–486. [Not seen]
- Kimura Ryūtoku 木村隆徳. 1985. "Tonkō shutsudo no Zōkan goishū" 敦煌出土の藏漢語彙集 [Pelliot Tibétain 1257: A Tibetan-Chinese Glossary Recovered from Tunhuang 敦煌]. In Hirakawa Akira hakushi koki kinenkai 平川彰博士古稀記念会, ed., *Bukkyō shisō no shomondai: Hirakawa Akira hakushi koki kinen ronshū* 仏教思想の諸問題: 平川彰博士古稀記念論集 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社): 627–642.
- . 1986. "Tonkō Chibetto-go Zen bunken ni okeru in'yō kyōmon" 敦煌チベット語禪文献に於ける引用経文 [Quotations from the Sūtras in the Tibetan Documents from Tun-huang Dealing with Ch'an (禪)]. In Yamaguchi Zuihō 山口瑞鳳 ed., *Chibetto no Bukkyō to Shakai* チベットの仏教と社会 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社): 55–77.
- Kritzer, Robert. 2012. "Tibetan Texts of *Garbhāvākṛāntisūtra*: Differences and Borrowings." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 15: 131–145.
- . 2014. *Garbhāvākṛāntisūtra: the Sūtra on Entry into the Womb*. *Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series* 31 (Tōkyō: International Institute for Buddhist Studies).
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1962. *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-Huang in the India Office Library* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Lalou, Marcelle. 1961. "Sūtra du Bodhisattva 'Roi de la Loi.'" *Journal Asiatique* 249/3: 321–332, + plates.
- Lamotte, Étienne [Paul Marie]. 1962. *L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa)*. Bibliothèque du Muséon 51 (Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste).
- Li, Channa. 2016. "Translationship Lost in Transmission: Elusive Attributions of Two Tibetan Sūtra Translations." *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 37: 207–230.
- Maeda Takashi 前田崇. 1992. "Chibettoyaku Bonmōkyō Rushana Bussetsu Bosatsu Shinchikai Bon" チベット訳『梵網經慮舍那仏説菩薩心地戒品』 [The Tibetan Translation of the *Fanwangjing Lüshena Foshuo Pusa xindijie pin*]. *Tendai Gakuhō* 天台学報 34: 89–94.
- Magnin, Paul. 2002. "L'orthodoxie en question: une étude du *Soutra de la concentration la plus profonde et souveraine (Zui miaosheng ding jing)*." In Catherine Despeux, ed., *Bouddhisme et Lettrés dans la Chine Médiévale* (Paris, Éditions Peeters): 229–299.

- Mair, Victor. 1993. *The Linguistic and Textual Antecedents of The Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish*. Sino-Platonic Papers 38 (Philadelphia: Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations, University of Pennsylvania).
- Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮. 1976. *Gikyō Kenkyū* 疑經研究 (Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūsho 京都大学人文科学研究所).
- Matsukawa, Takashi. 2004. “Some Uighur Elements Surviving in the Mongolian Buddhist *Sūta of the Great Bear*.” In Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Simone-Christiane Raschmann, Jens Wilkens, Marianne Yaldiz and Peter Zieme, eds., *Turfan Revisited—The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*. Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 17 (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag): 203–207.
- Mitsukawa Toyoki 光川豊芸. 1988. “Shoki Daijō to ‘Shōbō kujū’: toku ni ‘Furōna-e’ to ‘Butsuzō-kyō’ o chūshin ni” 初期大乘と「正法久住」—とくに「富樓那會」と「仏藏經」を中心に [On the Active Bodhisattva and Lazy Bhikṣu of the Early Mahāyāna Buddhism]. *Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 仏教学研究 44: 1–25.
- Miyazaki, Tenshō. 2007. “Discerning the Original Language of the Tibetan Versions of Mahāyāna Sūtras: From a Simple Mistake in the *IDem* [sic] *kar ma* Regarding the *Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodanāsūtra*.” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 55/3: 1101–1105 (73–77).
- Mollier, Christine. 2008. *Buddhism and Taoism Face to Face: Scripture, Ritual, and Iconographic Exchange in Medieval China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press).
- Nishio Kyōo 西尾京雄. 1940. *Butsujikyōron no Kenkyū* 佛地經論之研究 / *The Buddhahūmi-sūtra and the Buddhahūmi-vyākhyāna of Çilabhadra* (Nagoya: Hajinkaku shobō 破塵閣書房).
- Nishioka Soshū 西岡祖秀. 1980, 1981, 1983. “‘Putun Bukkyō-shi’ Mokurokubu Sakuin I, II & III” 「プトゥン仏教史」目録部索引 [An Index to the Catalogue Portion of Bu ston’s History of Buddhism]. *Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu Bunka Kōryū Kenkyū Shisetsu Kenkyū Kiyō* 東京大学文学部文化交流研究施設研究紀要 4: 61–92, 5: 43–94, 6: 47–201.
- . 1981. “Chibettoyaku *Bussetsu Tenchihachiyōshinju-kyō* no Tonkō shahon “チベット訳『仏説天地八陽神呪經』の敦煌写本 [Dunhuang manuscripts of the Tibetan translation of the *Tiandibayangshenzhou jing*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 30/1: 471–465 (37–43).
- Nobel, Julius Adolf Johannes. 1937. *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra: Das Goldglanz-sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz).
- . 1944. *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra: Das Goldglanz-sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. Die tibetischen Übersetzung mit einem Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1 (Leiden: E. J. Brill).
- . 1958. *Suvarṇaprabhāṣottamasūtra: das Goldglanz-Sūtra: ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. I-Tsing’s chinesische Version und ihre tibetische Übersetzung* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- Obata Hironobu 小島宏允. 1975. “Chibetto no Zenshū no zōyaku gikyō ni tsuite” チベットの禪宗と蔵訳偽經について [Tibetan Chan Buddhism and Tibetan translations of apocryphal scriptures]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 23/2: 170–171 (667–668).
- Oda, Juten 小田壽典. 1983. “Remarks on the Indic ‘lehgut’ of the Säkiz yükmäk yaruq sūtra.” In: Klaus Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker, eds., *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien. Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981*. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 16 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz): 65–72.
- . 1986. “Gikyō *Tenchihachiyōshinju-kyō* no denpa to tekisuto” 偽經本「天地八陽神呪經」の伝播とテキスト [A Study on the Spread of the Apocryphal Buddhist Text *Tiandibayangshenzhou jing*]. *Toyoashi Tanki Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 豊橋短期大学研究紀要 3: 61–74.
- . 2001. “A Genealogy of Texts of the *Bayangjing* Sūtra.” In Louis Bazin and Peter Zieme, eds., *De Dunhuang à Istanbul: Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*. Silk Road Studies 5 (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols): 233–243.
- . 2015a. *A Study of the Buddhist Sūtra called Säkiz Yükmäk Yaruq or Säkiz Törlügin Yarumış Yaltrımış in Old Turkic*. Berliner Turfantexte 33. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols. [Not seen]
- . 2015b. “Gikyō *Hachiyōkyō* shahon kara mita Bukkyō bunkashi no tenbō.” 偽經本「八陽經」写本からみた仏教文化史の展望 [Prospects for the study of Buddhist cultural history from the standpoint of manuscripts of the Apocryphal Buddhist Text *Bayang jing*]. *Nairiku Ajiashi Kenkyū* 内陸アジア史研究 30: 51–68.
- Oetke, Claus. 1977. *Die aus dem Chinesischen übersetzten tibetischen Versionen des Suvarṇaprabhāṣasūtra: philologische und linguistische Beiträge zur klassifizierenden Charakterisierung übersetzter Texte*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 18 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag).
- Okamoto Yoshiyuki 岡本嘉之. 1987. “Hōjō jūyaku *Kōmyō saishō kyō* shohon no hikaku kenkyū jōsetsu” 法成重訳『金光明最勝王經』諸本の比較研究序説 [An introduction to the comparative study of the *Suvarṇaprabhāṣottara-sūtra* with Chos-grub’s retranslated Tibetan texts]. *Tōyōgaku Kenkyū* 東洋学研究 21: 1–24.
- Okimoto Katsumi 沖本克己. 1978. “Zenshūshi ni okeru gikyō: *Hōōkyō* ni tsuite” 禪宗史に於ける偽經—『法王

- 經』について [The *Fawang jing* as an Apocryphal scripture in the Chan school]. *Zenbunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 禪文化研究所紀要 10: 27–61.
- . 1998. “Zen shisō keiseishi no kenkyū” 禪思想形成史の研究 [Studies on the development of Zen thought]. (Hanazono daigaku kokusai zengaku kenkyūjo 花園大学国際禅学研究所) *Kenkyū Hōkoku* 研究報告 5: 1–451.
- Panglung, Jampa L. 1991. “Die tibetische Version des Siebengestirn-sūtras.” In Ernst Steinkellner, ed., *Tibetan History and Language: Studies Dedicated to Uray Géza on his Seventieth Birthday*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 26 (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien): 399–416.
- Pedersen, K[usumita] Priscilla. 1980. “Notes on the Ratnakūta Collection.” *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 3/2: 60–66.
- Pelliot, Paul. 1908. “Une bibliothèque médiévale retrouvée au Kan-sou.” *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 8: 501–529.
- . 1914. “Notes à propos d'un catalogue du Kanjur.” *Journal Asiatique*, Onzième Série, Tome 4: 111–150.
- Porció, Tibor. 2003. “On the technique of translating Buddhist texts into Uygur.” In Sven Bretfeld and Jens Wilkens, *Indien und Zentrasiens: Sprach- und Kulturkontakt. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposions vom 7. bis 10. Mai 2001*. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 61. Wiesbaden: Harrssowitz: 85–94.
- Radich, Michael. 2015. “Tibetan Evidence for the Sources of Chapters of the Synoptic *Suvarṇa-prabhāsottama-sūtra* T 664 Ascribed to Paramārtha.” *Buddhist Studies Review* 32/2: 245–270.
- Ren Xiaobo 任小波. 2012. *Zangyi 'Shan'e yinguojing' duikan yu yanjiu* 藏譯〈善惡因果經〉對勘與研究. Beijing Zhongguo Renmin Daxue boshihou yanjiu baogao 北京中國人民大學博士後研究報告. (Beijing: Renmin Daxue 人民大學).
- Róna-Tas, A[ndrás]. 1971. “Tibetological Remarks on the Mongolian Versions of the ‘Thar-pa chen-po.’” *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou* (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve): 440–447.
- Rong Xinjiang. 1999–2000. “The nature of the Dunhuang library cave and the reasons for its sealing.” Trans. V. Hansen. *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 11, 247–275.
- Saerji. 2010. “The Translations of the Khotanese Monk Śīladharma Preserved in the Tibetan bka' 'gyur.” *Annual Report of The International Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 14: 185–222.
- Sakurabe, Bunkyō 櫻部文鏡. 1930. “Chibettoyaku Daihōshakukyō no kenkyū.” 西藏譯大寶積經の研究 [The Mahāratanakūṭa in Tibetan]. *Ōtani Gakuhō* 大谷學報 11/3: 134–175 (514–555).
- . 1930–1932. *A Comparative Analytical Catalogue of the Kanjur Division of the Tibetan Tripitaka* [sic]/ *Ōtani Daigaku Toshokanzō: Chibetto Daizōkyō Kanjūru Kandō Mokuroku*, 大谷大學図書館藏・西藏大藏經甘珠爾勘同目錄 3 vols. (Kyoto: Ōtani Daigaku Toshokan 大谷大學圖書館).
- Samten, Jampa. 1992. *A Catalogue of the Phug-brag Manuscript Kanjur / Phug brag bka' 'gyur bris ma' i dkar chag* (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives).
- Satō Naomi 佐藤直実. 2012. “Daijō Daihatsunehangyō jūyaku chibettogoyaku no yūyōsei” 大乘『大般涅槃經』重訳チベット語訳の有用性 [The Validity of a Second-Hand Tibetan Translation of the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-Sūtra*]. *Nihon Bukkyōgakkai nenpō* 日本仏教学会年報 77: 197–212.
- Schaeffer, Kurtis R., and Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp. 2009. *An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od of Bcom ldan ral gri*. Harvard Oriental Series 64 (Cambridge: Harvard Oriental Series, Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University).
- Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大. 1969 *Tendai shikan no kenkyū* 天台止観の研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店. [Not seen.]
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2008. *Managing Monks: Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*. (New York: Oxford University Press).
- . 2014. “Out of the East: Tibetan Scripture Translations from Chinese.” *Bod rig pa' i dus deb / Zangxue xuekan* 藏學學刊 / *Journal of Tibetology* 9: 29–36.
- . 2016. “Peering Through a Funhouse Mirror: Trying to Read Indic Texts Through Tibetan and Chinese Translations.” In Dorji Wangchuk, ed., *Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts: Theories and Practices of Translation*. Indian and Tibetan Studies 5. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg: 287–311.
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander Wilhelm, Baron von. 1936. “The Emperor Ch'ien-Lung and the Larger *Śūrangamasūtra*.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 1: 136–146 + plates.
- Stein, Rolf A. 1983. “Tibetica antiqua I. Les deux vocabulaires des traductions indo-tibétaine et sino-tibétaine dans les manuscrits de Touen-houang.” *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 72: 149–236. Translated as “Tibetica antiqua I. The two vocabularies of Indo-Tibetan and Sino-Tibetan translations in the Dunhuang manuscripts.” In Arthur P. McKeown, trans. and ed., *Rolf Stein's Tibetica Antiqua, with additional materials*. Brill's Tibetan Studies Library 24 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010): 1–96.
- Takakusu, Junjirō. 1901. “Tales of the Wise Man and the Fool, in Tibetan and Chinese.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* July 1901: 447–460.

- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道. 1978. “Some Problems of the Tibetan translations from Chinese Material.” In Louis Ligeti, ed., *Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium, held at Mátrafüred, Hungary, 24–30 September 1976*. Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 23 (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó): 459–467.
- . 1986. “Chibettoyaku *Kongō zanmaikyō* oboegaki” チベット訳『金剛三昧経』覚え書 [A Note on the Tibetan Translation of the Chin-kang-san-mei-ching (金剛三昧経)]. In Yamaguchi Zuihō 山口瑞鳳, ed., *Chibetto no Bukkyō to Shakai* チベットの仏教と社会 (Tokyo: Shunūsha 春秋社): 3–30
- Takata Tokio 高田時雄. 1988. *Tonkō shiryō ni yoru Chūgokugoshi-no kenkyū: 9, 10-seiki-no Kasei hōgen* 敦煌資料による中國語史の研究 — 九・十世紀の河西方言 [A Historical Study of the Chinese Language Based on Duhuang Materials: The Hexi Dialect of the 9th and 10th Centuries] (Tokyo: Sōbunsha 創文社).
- Tatz, Mark. 1994. *The Skill in Means (Upāyakaśalya) Sūtra* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).
- Tauscher, Helmut. 2008. *Catalogue of the Gondhla proto-Kanjur*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 72 (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien).
- Teiser, Stephen F. 1994. *The Scripture of the Ten Kings and the Making of Purgatory in Medieval Chinese Buddhism*. Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism 9 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press).
- Terjék, J. 1969, 1970. “Fragments of the Tibetan Sutra of «The Wise and the Fool» from Tun-huang.” *Acta Orientalia (Hungary)*: 22/3: 289–334; 23/1: 55–83.
- Tokiya Yukinori 釋舎幸紀. 1990. “Kōjun to jihō no mondai: Bonmōkyō o chūshin to shite” 孝順と慈悲の問題: 梵網經を中心として [Śīla and Vinaya of the *Fan-wang-ching*]. *Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 仏教学研究 45/46: 52–69.
- Ueyama Daishun 上山大峻. 1967/1968 [1990]. “Daiban-koku Daitoku Sanzō Hōshi Shamon Hōjō no Kenkyū” 大蕃國大徳三藏法師沙門法成の研究 [A study of the life and works of Facheng, a translator of Buddhist texts at Dunhuang under Tibetan rule]. *Tōhō Gakuhō* 東方學報 38: 133–198; 39: 119–222. Reprinted in *Ajia Bunkashi Ronsō* アジア文化史論叢 I [Contributions to West, Central and North Asian Studies: Collected papers of Liu-sha Hai-hsi (流沙海西) Scholarship prize winners] (Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppan 山川出版, 1978): 1–179. Again reprinted in *Tonkō Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 敦煌佛教の研究 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館, 1990). References are to the last item.
- van Schaik, Sam. 2014. *The Tibetan Chan Manuscripts: A Complete Descriptive Catalogue of Tibetan Chan Texts in the Dunhuang Manuscript Collections*. Papers on Central Eurasia 1(41) (Bloomington: Sinor Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, Indiana University).
- Vinītā, Bhikṣunī (Vinita Tseng). 2010. *A unique collection of twenty sūtras in a Sanskrit manuscript from the Potala: Editions and translation* [Sanskrit texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region 7] (Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House / Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences).
- Weber, Julius, and Georg Huth. 1891. “Das buddhistische Sūtra der ‘Acht Erscheinungen’.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 45/4: 577–591.
- Woon Wanloo 溫婉如. 2012. *Beiben Niepanjing - Xianbingpin guzangyiben yuwen tese zhi yanjiu* 北本《涅槃經・現病品》古藏譯本語文特色之研究 [Linguistic Features of the Tibetan Translation of the “Chapter on the Manifestation of Illness” in the Chinese *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* (T 374)]. MA Thesis, Taipei, Taiwan: Dharma Drum Buddhist College 法鼓佛教學院佛教學系.
- Yuyama, Akira. 1981. *Sanskrit fragments of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*. Studia Philologica Buddhica Occasional Paper Series 4 (Tokyo: Reiyukai Library).
- Zorin, Alexander. 2018 “A Dunhuang Tibetan Manuscript of ‘Ārya-samādhyagrottama’ Kept at the IOM, RAS.” *Written Monuments of the Orient* 1/7: 25–34.