Translationship Lost in Transmission: Elusive Attributions of Two Tibetan Sūtra Translations

Channa Li[1]

(Leiden University)

To a certain extent, the transmission of Buddhism into Tibet can be understood as the history of the translation of Buddhist texts into Tibetan. The study of early Tibetan translations[2] can thus perform more than a purely philological function. It can also shed light on many unresolved and even unconsidered ideological and historical problems. This paper will illustrate the fruits of one such study. Through an investigation of the source language of certain Tibetan translations, I aim to problematise the oversimplified image of Tibetan translationship[3] and contribute a new perspective to the history of early Tibetan Buddhism. From our historical perspective, we can say that Tibetan Buddhists in later times[4] tended to exaggerate the Indian influence and minimise the

---

[1]   For a number of valuable suggestions on this paper I would like to thank Prof. J.A. Silk and my colleague Chen Ruixuan.

[2]   Here, early Tibetan translations refer to those finished and compiled before the *phyi dar,* the period of second dissemination when Tibetan Buddhism became full-fledged. The Dunhuang Tibetan texts and the imperial-era portion of the Kanjurs proved invaluable resources for this study.

[3]   For example, a highly partisan attitude is reflected in the famous legend of the bSam yas Debate, first recorded in the 11th-century *dBa' bzhed,* the earliest edition of the *Testament of Ba*. This source was utilised by nearly all later historiographies when recounting the establishment of Buddhism in Tibet. This debate is said to have occurred at bSam yas Temple in the 8th century. The Indian Paṇḍita Kamalaśīla defeated the Chinese Chan monk Moheyan in debate and, as a result, Chinese Chan was banned from Tibet. The historical veracity of this tale is challenged, however, by the content of the Dunhuang manuscripts. There are dozens of Tibetan translations and original writings that demonstrate the presence of Chinese Chan in Tibet from the 8th to the 11th century. That is to say, at least during the timespan of the Dunhuang manuscripts, Chinese Buddhism was an indispensable source for Tibetan Buddhism, despite what the later Tibetan historiographies, which intentionally obscure this influence, would lead us to believe. See Shen 2011, van Schaik 2014, 2015.

[4]   "Later" here not only means the *phyi dar* period but also the imperial time when Tibetans already conducted the revision and standardisation of Tibetan translations.

legacies of Buddhism from other regions, among which the most obvious case is Chinese Buddhism. The complex origins of Tibetan Buddhism were elided by later Tibetan historiographies that endeavored to connect it to prestigious Indian lineages.[5] In addition, this early history was also blurred by the practice of standardising Tibetan translations that took place in the imperial era and the compilation of the Tibetan Kanjurs in the *phyi dar*.[6] Although the Kanjurs are the richest available repositories of Tibetan translations assembled during the imperial era, the act of compiling the canons entailed intentional selection and reification, and even deliberate excision and manipulation,[7] which inevitably resulted in a great loss of diversity and interpretive flexibility.

The studies of pre-classical Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts remind us of how much we might have lost.[8] In contrast to the transmitted texts of histories, which have selectively manipulated the past for various political or religious reasons, these manuscripts preserve contemporary data. Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts usually provide us with more than one version of translations of a single Buddhist text, some of which can be identified with the version in the Tibetan Canons, but some of which can not.[9] Considering the

---

[5]   For example, the *bKa' chems ka khol ma* locates India in the cosmic center and describes Tibetan emperors as the descendents of Indian Śākya clan. This interpretation was adopted by many later historiographies such as the *Deb ther dmar po* and the *rGyal rabs gsal ba'i me long.* Also see Davidson 2004.

[6]   The Tibet Kanjurs cannot be treated as a singular entitiy. They consist mainly of two distinct lineages which diverge in terms of textual organisation and text reading, due to differing histories of transmission and editing. See Harrison 1996; Silk 1996; Eimer 2002, 2012.

[7]   This process can be observed in the *sBa bzhed zhabs brtags pa* (abbr. as *sBa bzhed*), the supplemental version of the *Testament of Ba*. It recounts how Emperor Khri gTsug lde brtsan (c. 806–838CE), when he realised that Tibetan translations drew upon multiple-language sources, ordered his scribes to 'sanctify' the texts in Sanskrit (*rgya dkar po'i skad*). The *Sba bzhed* (2009: 63) reads: *chos la la rgya nag po'i skad du smra/ chos la la rgya dkar po'i skad du smra/ chos la la bal po dang u rgyan gyi skad du smra bas mes kyi dam pa'i lha chos lugs dang chos skad sna tshogs su 'byung ba ni ma legs te/ sangs rgyas rgya dkar por byon nas/ chos dang po rgya dkar du gsungs pa yin pas/ nga 'ang chos rgya dkar po'i lugs su mgrin gcig tu byed ces bka' stsal nas* (Tong & Huang 1990: 184–5). I translated this passage as: "There are some dharmas in Chinese, some in Sanskrit, and some others in the languages of Nepal and Uddiyana. It is not good that our ancestors' divine dharma exists in different traditions and languages. The Buddha came from India, and the dharma was originally spoken in Sanskrit. I should thus use the same language as the Indian tradition."

[8]   There are a large number of related studies, a complete list of which is hard, and of course needless, to give here. Just to name a few: Okimoto 1976, 1975–1977; Ueyama 1968, 1974, 1983, 1987; Karmay 1989; Shen 2011; van Schaik 2014, 2015.

[9]   The works whose Dunhuang versions of translations differ from those in the Kanjurs include the *dGe bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog gi 'dus pa* (PT 89, translated

substantial number of Chinese Buddhist texts imported into Tibet when the Tibetan Emperor Khri Srong lde btsan (742–c. 800 CE) decided to convert to Buddhism, as described in the *Testament of Ba* and its *Supplement*,[10] the *bKa' chems ka khol ma* and *mKhas pa'i dga' ston* it is plausible that most of the parallel translations from Chinese, if they ever existed, had been lost or replaced during the early transmission. The update and replacement of Tibetan translations can be indeed observed when we compare two imperial catalogs, the earlier *lDan dkar ma* and the later *'Phang thang ma* (both of them only register the titles and some textual information, instead of containing the whole text). The record of text length in the *lDan dkar ma* sometimes differs from the length of the text bearing the same name in the *'Phang thang ma*; and in other cases, a text recorded as a translation from Chinese in the *lDan dkar ma* ends up as a translation from Sanskrit in the *'Phang thang ma*. All these inconsistencies suggest that either some texts in the *lDan dkar ma* might have been replaced by other texts under the same name when the *'Phang thang ma* was compiled, or the editors of the *'Phang thang ma* might have tampered with the textual information.[11]

This kind of replacement, in addition to later textual revisions in the Kanjurs, could result in mistakes about the source, especially when no colophons were preserved. It remains a challenging task to

---

from Chinese, see T 310–31 《大寶積經恒河上優婆夷會》 by an anonymous translator; the *sNang pa mtha' yas kyi mdo* (PT 758, translated from Chinese, see T 366 《佛說阿彌陀經》) by an anonymous translator; the *Byang chub sems dpa' byams pas zhus pa'i 'dul pa* (PT 89, translated from Chinese, see T 310–42 《大寶積經彌勒菩薩所問會》) by an anonymous translator; and the *'Od dpag med kyi bkod pa* (PT 96, 557, 563, 561, 562, 564, translated from Chinese, see T 310–5 《大寶積經無量壽如來會》). Furthermore, some translated texts from Chinese are only preserved in Dunhuang manuscripts. One example is the *'Phags pa dus dang dus ma yin pa bstan pa zhes bya ba'i mdo* (ITJ 213, Chinese see T 794a&b 《佛說時非時經》) by Chos grub. This text cannot be found in any other sources. See Ueyama 1990 129; Silk and Li, *forthcoming*.

[10] The earliest version of the *Testament of Ba*, bearing the name *dBa' bzhed,* can be dated earlier than the 11th century, due to the discovery of its fragments from the Dunhuang caves. See van Schaik and Iwao 2008: 447, 479. Pasang and Diemberger 2000: xiv (Sørenson's introduction), 8, 11–14. The dating of its supplement version, that is the *sBa bzhed*, has aroused academic debate for a long time. Richardson and Imaeda ascribed it to the late 14th century, and Stein assumed it is posterior to the 11th century. Karmay found its quotation in the 12th century work *Me tog snying po* by Nyang ral Nyi ma 'od zer (1136–1204). Moreover, its title was mentioned by Sa pan Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1181–1282). See Richardson 1952: 4; Stein 1961: iii; Imaeda 1975: 126; Karmay 2007: 33.

[11] Silk and Li, *forthcoming*. It is possible that both the *lDan dkar ma* and the *'Phang thang ma* were revised by editors in the *phyi dar*. Therefore, there is a chance that more information about the translations from Chinese had already been removed.

identify and correct any such mistakes that might have occurred. This is because, although we may presume that original translations from Chinese should differ from Sanskrit translations in some respects, Tibetan Buddhism *ipso facto* standardised translation lexicons and rules in the imperial period (e.g. with the composition of the *Mahāvyutpatti*) as mentioned above, lessening the likelihood of identifying the original language from a purely terminological approach. Furthermore, it is crucial to acknowledge the possibility that some Tibetan translations asserted to be Sanskrit renderings might not have sprung from a single source but relied on several recensions during the translation. Specifically, even if Tibetan translators did gain access to a Sanskrit text, they might have referred to other available versions, such as pre-existing Tibetan or Chinese translations, without acknowledging them as their sources in the colophon.

Some scholars have already added to our knowledge of early Tibetan translation practices by studying the Tibetan translations from Chinese. In contrast to the obvious domination of the texts translated from Sanskrit in today's Tibetan Canons, Tucci stated that the number of texts translated from Chinese in the early phase of Tibetan Buddhism could be greater than that of translations from Sanskrit.[12] His argument was based on records from *mKhas pa'i dga' ston*. This very text gives an account that a Chinese named Sang shi, an intimate of Khri Srong lde btsan, brought some Chinese Buddhist texts back to Tibet. It further offers a legendary story similar to the tantric Terma tradition: Sang shi concealed these Chinese texts as the time for preaching Buddhism was not ripe in Tibet, and after a few years he unearthed and spread them.[13] It also relates to us that the famous Buddhist sBa gSal snang followed the instructions from Chinese monks before he went to India and Nepal to seek for more Buddhist teachings.[14] Stein made a significant contribution to clarifying two kinds of vocabularies used by early Tibetan translators, that is, the Indian vocabulary and the Chinese vocabulary.[15] Ueyama and Wu respectively made detailed studies on Chos grub, a Dunhuang- based bilingual or even trilingual translator active in the 9th century who was mainly in charge of the Tibetan translations from Chinese.[16] Oetke drew our attention to multiple versions of the Tibetan *Suvarṇaprabhāsasūtra* (which he termed Tib.

---

[12]   Tucci 1958: 47–49.
[13]   See *mKhas pa'i dga' ston* 1980: ja, 73b–77b. Huang 1989: 55–60. Tucci 1958: 22–24. Jackson 1994: 71ff. Also see *sBa bzhed* 1980: 22.
[14]   *mKhas pa'i dga' ston* 1980: ja, 76a6. Huang 1989: 58.
[15]   Stein 2010: 1–96.
[16]   Ueyama 1990: 112–169; Wu 1984.

III, IV, V) that were translated or partly translated from Chinese, and showed how Tibetan people understood its Chinese origin.[17] His study was supplemented by Radich's recent research on another Tibetan version of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsasūtra* (D 556) that was alleged to have been translated from Sanskrit by its colophon, but in reality was a translation referring to both Chinese and Sanskrit.[18] Focusing on two sūtras that were translated into Tibetan from both Sanskrit and Chinese, Silk and Li attempted to list all extant pre-modern Tibetan sūtra translations from Chinese with reference to records in the *lDan dkar ma*, the *'Phang thang ma*, the *bsTan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od*, the *Bu ston chos 'byung* and several Kanjur Catalogs, and to clarify how Tibetan editors treated the translations from Chinese over a long time (from the imperial era to the time when the great bulk of texts was compiled into Kanjur, c.a. the 15th century) compared with the parallel translations from Sanskrit.[19]

In short, due to the distortion and absence of early records, and because of the present limitations of our knowledge, the intricacies of early Tibetan translation practices are still so elusive that modern scholars sometimes feel helpless in identifying the source language of a certain sūtra without a helpful colophon. The same mystery can confront us in sūtras with attributed translators. Two sūtras, the *Upāyakauśalyasūtra* and the *Maitreyaparipṛcchāsūtra*, both of which are included in the Tibetan and Chinese Ratnakūṭa collections, contain flatly wrong or at least misleading translation attributions. They, therefore, present interesting case studies that can contribute to our understanding of early Tibetan translation practices and their historical implications.

1. Maitreyaparipṛcchā

Maitreya is quite popular in Chinese Buddhist circles and scriptures associated with Maitreya have been translated into Chinese from a very early date.[20] The Tibetan Kanjurs attest that Chinese scriptures are one important source of Tibetan Maitreya texts. The *'Phags pa byang chub sems dpa' byams pa dga' ldan gnas su skye ba blangs pa'i mdo* (D 199) was translated from the Chinese T 452 *Foshuo Guan Mile*

---

17   Oetke 1977: 5–20.
18   Radich 2015.
19   Silk and Li, *forthcoming*.
20   See Lee 1983: 15–54.

Shangsheng Doushuaitian Jing 《佛說觀彌勒上升兜率天經》.[21] The *lDan dkar ma* registers a sūtra (No. 265B)[22] entitled *'Phags pa byams pas lung bstan pa* with 110 ślokas as a translation from Chinese. [23]

It appears that no scholar has realised that another Maitreya scripture, the *Maitreyaparipṛcchāsūtra*, has recensions translated from Chinese as well. The circulating version of *Maitreyaparipṛcchā* (D 85, abbr. Maitreya Tib I) can be found in the Tibetan Ratnakūṭa collection credited to Jinamitra, Surendrabodhi, and Ye shes sde. It is similar in content to the palm-leaf Sanskrit fragment IOL San 1492b (Ch. 0079b) found in Dunhuang,[24] although differences between these two texts can easily be observed. Two Chinese recensions are found in the Chinese Tripitaka. The first one, T 349 *Mile Pusa Suowen Benyuan Jing* 《彌勒菩薩所問本願經》(abbr. Maitreya Chin I), is translated by Dharmarakṣa and shares a similar Indic source with Maitreya Tib I. The second Chinese recension, the *Mile Pusa Suowen Hui*《彌勒菩薩所問會》(T 310–42, abbr. Maitreya Chin II), was compiled into the Chinese Ratnakūṭa and ascribed to Bodhiruci.

Recently, a Dunhuang Tibetan manuscript titled *Byang chub sems dpa' byams pas zhus pa* (PT 89, abbr. Maitreya Tib II) was identified by Jonathan Silk as a faithful translation from Maitreya Chin II. In order to make it easier for readers to follow my argument, I divide the five different versions into two lineages:

- *The First lineage: Maitreya Tib I, Sanskrit and Maitreya Chin I*
- *The Second lineage: Maitreya Tib II, translated from Maitreya Chin II*

The comparison and translation of the Maitreya Tib II and Chin II will be published in my forthcoming book co-authored with Jonathan Silk. Due to space limitations, here I will only compare the section where the Tibetan translation appears to deviate from its Chinese counterpart to demonstrate how faithful the Tibetan translation is to the Chinese original source.

---

[21]   The colophon of the Derge Kanjur version states: *'phags pa byang chub sems dpa' byams pa dga' ldan gnas su skye ba blangs pa'i mdo rdzogs so* ‖ *zhu ba'i lo tsā ba bande pab tong dang | bande shes rab seng ges rgya'i dpe las bsgyur* ‖ ‖ (tsa, 303a4–6)

[22]   See Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 146.

[23]   No extant known text in the Kanjurs carries the same name as No. 265B in the *lDan dkar ma*, but it seems plausible to identify it with D 199, in light of the text's length, but also its content. The title in the *lDan dkar ma* informs us that the text focuses on the prophecy (*lung bstan*) given to Maitreya by the Buddha, and this is also the main concern of D 199. However, considering that most sūtras on Maitreya concern prophecy, this supposition requires more supporting evidence.

[24]   See La Vallée Poussin 1912: 1077–79. Matsumura 1993: 143–45.

Maitreya Chin II (T 310–42: 628b2–4)	Maitreya Tib II [25] (PT 89: 1v3–4)
佛告彌勒菩薩言：“善哉！善哉！彌勒，汝今為欲<u>哀愍一切，利益安樂天人世間</u>，能問如來如是深義， 汝應諦聽，善思念之，吾當為汝<u>分別解說</u>。”	bcom ldan ʼdas gyïs byang chub sems dpa' byams pa la bkaʼ stsal pa ǀ ǀ byams pa khyod <u>lha dang myïr bcas paʼï ʼjïg rten thams cad la snyïng brtse zhïng phan gdags paʼï</u> phyir ǀ de bzhïn gshegs pa la ʼdï lta buʼï don zab mo dag zhus pa legs so legs so ǀ ǀ khyod legs par nyon la ǀ yïd la zungs shïg dangǀ ngas khyod la <u>rnam par phye ste yang dag par bshad par bya'o</u> ǀ ǀ
The Buddha responded to Bodhisattva Maitreya, saying: "Good! Good! Maitreya, now, in order to <u>show compassion for all, and bring benefits as well as happiness to the world of gods and men</u>, you ask the Tathāgata about such profound meaning. You should attentively listen and well ponder it, and I will <u>explain it in detail for you</u>.	The Buddha responded to Bodhisattva Maitreya: "Maitreya, in order to <u>show compassion and bring benefits to all the worlds with their gods and men</u>, you ask the Tathāgata about such profound meaning. Good! Good! You should attentively listen and imprint it upon mind, and I will <u>differentiate and explain accurately for you</u>."

The first seeming alteration is highlighted above (哀愍一切利益安樂天人世間 ≈ *lha dang myïr bcas paʼï ʼjïg rten thams cad la snyïng brtse zhïng phan gdags pa*). The Chinese sentence here is in clear contravention to the usual Chinese antithetical parallelism. This may have confused the Tibetan translators, leading them to reorganise the order of the Chinese words. It might also be possible that the Tibetan translators knew of the rhetorical device in Chinese called *huwen* 互文, wherein a complete sentence is split into two parts whose recombination is necessary to reacquire the complete meaning. If we understand the Chinese text as utilising such a *huwen* device, its meaning would become "to commiserate with, benefit and delight all the worlds with their gods and men" (*哀愍利益安樂一切天人世間) and the Tibetan translation is more than precise in understanding its original.

At the end of the chart, another misunderstanding can easily be discerned. *Fenbie jieshuo* 分別解說 is translated into Tibetan verbatim as *rnam par phye ste yang dag par bshad par bya*. In reality, *fenbie jieshuo*

---

should be a rendering from the Sanskrit *vyākaraṇa,* meaning "detailed explanation." But here the Tibetan translator took *fenbie* and *jieshuo* for two separate verbs.

The translation from Sanskrit was canonised while the Chinese translation ceased to circulate in Tibetan society, which reminds us of my earlier hypothesis of the replacement of scriptures translated from Chinese in the *lDan dkar ma* with translations from Sanskrit in the *'Phang thang ma*. Tibetan Buddhists might have favored the versions from Sanskrit when translations from both Sanskrit and Chinese were available, and thus those from Chinese were replaced or excised and eventually disappeared.

Maitreya Tib I might be assumed to have a Sanskrit source, considering the participation of Jinamitra, Surendrabodhi and Ye shes sde. However, careful investigation reveals a more complex situation. Although the main part of Maitreya Tib I should be based on a Sanskrit text similar to the extant fragment IOL San 1492b, philological examination shows that Maitreya Tib I is not a pure translation from Sanskrit and that it relied on Chinese parallels during translation.

The first evidence to support this assertion appears in the opening scene where the name of the sermon's location is mentioned. In Maitreya Tib I, the sermon is placed in *yul <u>barga</u>*[26] *na chu srin byis pa gsod lta bu'i ri 'jigs su rung ba'i nags ri dags kyi nags na* (104b3–4), translated as "in the place of <u>Barga/Barge</u>, in the Deer Grove among the horrible forests in the mountain (physically) resembling the Śimśumāra, a child-killing water-monster."[27] It is difficult to identify what the name "*barga/barge*" indicates, as it can neither be connected to a regular Sanskrit word nor does it recur in the Kanjurs as far as I can tell from an electronic search. However, when we check the Chinese translation *piqi* 披祇 in the difficult sentence 披祇國妙華山中恐懼樹間鹿所聚處 from Maitreya Chin I, the knot can be untied. *Piqi* 披祇 is definitely an erratum of *baqi* 拔祇,[28] transliterated from the Sanskrit toponym. The Tibetan *barga* should, in turn, be transliterated from the Chinese *baqi* 拔祇, which can be supported by Medieval Chinese phonology. *Ba* 拔 is reconstructed as "bat,"[29] with an entering tone (入聲, the tone whose syllables end in -p, -t, -k) and *qi* 祇 is reconstructed as "gjei"[30] in early Middle Chinese. The entering tone of "-t"

---

26   Derge Kanjur: *ba rga*; Narthang & Stog Kanjur: *barge*; Peking Kanjur: *ba rgo*; Shel dkar & Gondhla Kanjur: *pa rge*; Urga Kanjur: *parga*; Phug brag Kanjur: *ma rga*.

27   "śimśu(ṃ)māra," "child-killing," the Gangetic porpoise, *Delphinus Gangeticus*. See *Monier Williams Dictionary* s.v.

28   I find that it was independently noted by Elsa Legittimo 2008 [2010]: 271, n. 49.

29   Pulleyblank 1991: 27; Schuessler 2009: 237; Guo 1986: 5.

30   Pulleyblank 1991: 246; Schuessler 2009: 121; Guo 1986: 73.

weakened after the 8th century, as can be attested by Dunhuang manuscripts where the "-t" entering tone can be represented by the "-r" entering tone. For example, the Tibetan manuscript ITJ 724: 2 transcribes 阿彌陀佛 (Amitābha) as *a mye ta pur*, and we can clearly see the "-t" entering tone in 佛 (*bhut*) was replaced by the "-r" ending tone in *pur*.[31]

The Indic origin of Chinese *baqi* 拔祇 is somewhat unclear. Usually, *baqi* 拔祇 is linked to the Sanskrit toponym *Vṛji*,[32] one of the sixteen major states at the time of Śākyamuni, but the term also appears in the *Zengyi Ahan Jing*《增一阿含經》attested as *Bhagga* in Pali. The *Zengyi Ahan Jing* narrates one sermon in 拔祇國尸牧摩羅山鬼林鹿園,[33] and the Pali parallel in the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* is *bhaggesu (viharati) susumāragire bhesakaḷāvane migadāye* (*Saṃyutta Nikāya* 22.1). This should be the Indic source of Chinese *拔祇國妙華山中恐懼樹間鹿所聚處.[34] The problem confronting us is whether Tibetan *Barge/Barga* was translated from the Chinese *baqi* 拔祇 or from an Indic word similar to *Bhagga*. The attested Sanskrit parallel for the Pāli *Bhagga* is *Bhārga.* The difficulty of establishing a direct connection between the Tibetan *Barge/Barga* and the Sanskrit *Bhārga* is that the Tibetan does not contain the aspirate. If we carefully examine the Tibetan transliteration of Sanskrit, it can be perceived that Tibetans usually distinguished the aspirated "bh" from unaspirated "b."[35] Therefore, unless more convincing contradictory evidence is uncovered, it is likely that the Tibetan *Barge/Barga* came from the Chinese *baqi* 拔祇.

The second piece of evidence connects Maitreya Tib I to the other Chinese recension, that is, to the Maitreya Chin II. In the paragraph on the teaching of the "ten dharmas" to attain Buddhahood, the occurrence of the rare Tibetan expression "*thabs kyis 'gro ba'i ting nge 'dzin dang ldan pa yin*" seems to be a translation of the counterpart in Maitreya Chin II.

> Maitreya Chin II (T 310–42: 628c19–29): "一者，善能成就金剛三昧；二者，成就處非處相應三昧；**三者，成就方便行三昧**；四者，成就遍照明三昧；五者，成就普光明三昧；六者，成就普遍照明三昧；七者，成

---

[31] Silk, *forthcoming*.

[32] T 1 *Chang Ahan Jing*《長阿含經》: 34b20–21.

[33] T 125: 573a1−2.

[34] *Miaohua Shan* 妙華山 might be hypothetically restored as *sukusumagiri, which could be an error for the Prākrit *Suṃsumāragiri*. *Kongjushu jian* 恐懼樹間 and *Lu suo ju chu* 鹿所聚處 were translated from *bhesakaḷāvana* and *migadāya* respectively.

[35] Transliterations of Sanskrit titles in the Kanjurs seldom confuse the "b" and "bh." Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts (such as PT 396) usually differentiate the two phonemes.

就寶月三昧；八者，成就月燈三昧；九者，成就出離三昧；十者，成就
勝幢臂印三昧，是名為十。彌勒菩薩成就如是法已，離諸惡道及惡知識，
速能證得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提。"

Maitreya Tib I (D 85: 107b7–108a4): *rdo rje lta bu'i ting nge 'dzin dang ldan pa yin | | gnas dang gnas ma yin pa la mngon par brtson pa'i ting nge 'dzin dang ldan pa yin |* **thabs kyis 'gro ba'i ting nge 'dzin dang ldan pa yin** *| rnam par snang byed kyi ting nge 'dzin dang ldan pa yin | | kun nas snang ba'i ting nge 'dzin dang ldan pa yin | kun du gsal ba'i ting nge 'dzin dang ldan pa yin | | rin chen zla ba'i ting nge 'dzin dang ldan pa yin | zla ba sgron ma'i ting nge 'dzin dang ldan pa yin | nyon mongs pa med pa'i ting nge 'dzin dang ldan pa yin | | rgyal mtshan gyi rtse mo'i dpung rgyan gyi ting nge 'dzin dang ldan pa yin te | byams pa byang chub sems dpa' chos bcu po de dag dang ldan na ngan song thams cad spong zhing sdig pa'i grogs po'i lag tu mi 'gro la myur du bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub mngon par rdzogs par 'tshang rgya'o | |*

The unusual Tibetan expression could be understood as a literal translation of the Chinese phrase 成就方便行三昧, where *thabs kyis* corresponds to *fangbian*方便 and *'gro ba* to *xing* 行.[36] *Xing* 行 was misunderstood as "to go"(*'gro ba*) rather than "to practice."

Our third clue can be found in the section that describes the Brahman youth Bhadraśuddha's first beholding of the Buddha Jyotivikrīḍitābhijña. The relevant passages are cited in the chart below.

Maitreya Chin I (T 349: 188a1–2)	<u>從園觀出</u>，遙見如來經行，身色光明，無央數變。
Maitreya Chin II (T 310–42: 629b2–7)	<u>從園苑出</u>，見彼如來，端正殊妙，諸根寂靜，得奢摩他，如清淨池、無諸垢穢，三十二相、八十種好而自莊嚴，如娑羅樹、其花開敷，如須彌山、出過一切，面貌熙怡、如月盛滿，威光赫奕、如日顯曜，形量周圓、如尼俱陀樹。
Maitreya Tib I (D 85: 109a5–109b1)	<u>de skyed mos tshal du 'gro ste	grong bar du phyin pa dang |</u> de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas snang bas rnam par rol pa'i mngon par shes pa mdzes pa	dad par bya ba	dbang po zhi ba	thugs zhi ba	dul ba dang zhi gnas kyi mchog brnyes pa	dul ba dang zhi gnas kyi dam pa brnyes pa	dbang po bsrungs pa	glang po che dbang po thul ba lta bu	mtsho ltar dang zhing rnyog pa med la gsal ba	skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum cu rtsa gnyis po dag gis sku legs par brgyan pa	

---

[36] For the complete passage, see Silk and Li, *forthcoming*.

	dpe byad bzang po brgyad cu po dag gis sku rnam par spras pa	shing sā la'i rgyal po me tog shin tu rgyas pa 'dra ba	ri'i rgyal po ri rab ltar mngon par 'phags pa	zhal zla ba'i dkyil 'khor ltar zhi ba	nyi ma'i dkyil 'khor ltar lham me lhan ne lhang nge ba	shing nya gro dha ltar chu zheng gab pa 'od 'bar ba'i sku dpal chen pos 'bar ba mthong ngo		
IOL San 1492b (Ch. 0079b): r5–6.	atha so ˈntarāpaṇamadhyagato 'drākṣīt taṃ jyotivikrīḍitābhijñaṃ tathāgatam arhaṇtaṃ saṃmyaksaṃbuddhaṃ śāntendriyaṃ śāntamānasam uttamadamaśamathaparamapāramiprāptaṃ paramadamaśamathaparamapāramiprāptaṃ nāgaṃ jitendriyaṃ hradam ivācchaṃ viprasannam anāvilaṃ suvarṇayūpam ivābhyudgataṃ śriyāt rājamānaṃ tapamānaṃ virocamānaṃ dvātṛṃśadbhir mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇais samanvāgatam

The underlined Tibetan sentence can be understood as "when coming towards the garden, he entered a village," using the terminative case "du" to indicate the goal of the journey.[37] Using similar redundant locution to describe locations is not common in Tibetan sūtras, and I can not find other cases in the Kanjurs. Therefore, I hypothesise that the Tibetan translators must have had both Chinese and Indic sources at hand during translation. They combined elements from both Chinese and Sanskrit in their translation and modified the Chinese part in order to achieve semantic coherence. In both Chinese versions, Bhadraśuddha's beholding occurred when he came out of the garden (Maitreya Chin I 從園觀出 / Maitreya Chin II 從園苑出), while the Sanskrit fragment informs us that the beholding took place when Badraśuddha was "in a village/marketplace" (*antarāpaṇamadhyagata*).[38] If both Chinese versions portray the situation in the same way, the Tibetan translators may have inferred that the Indic source of the Chinese translations should contain the part "went out of the garden" and thus supplemented this section accordingly.[39]

---

[37] Hill 2011: 33.
[38] The Tibetan *grong bar du phyin pa* is translated word for word from *antarāpaṇamadhyagata*, although the translation is not completely correct. The Sanskrit compound here functions as a locative in meaning, and *gata* has lost its original sense of an action, and now only indicates Badraśuddha's destination.
[39] Still, it is possible that Tibetan translators possessed another Sanskrit text that was different from both the extant Sanskrit text and the Chinese texts.

The Chinese recensions may have served as reference materials during the translation of Maitreya Tib I. It is possible that the Tibetan translators obtained an illegible, corrupted, or incomplete Sanskrit text and thus Ye shes sde's group had to look to the Chinese recensions for supplementary or double-checking purposes. In this case, Ye shes sde's translation group, instead of relying solely on an Indic source, performed a hybrid translation partly reliant on Chinese sources.

In conclusion, the analysis of the source language of Maitreya Tib I reveals that the texts described by the Kanjur colophons as translations from Sanskrit may not originate from Sanskrit alone. It would be naive to assume that Ye shes sde's translation group relied solely on Sanskrit sources and completely ignored any Chinese parallels. As the following section will continue to demonstrate, Ye shes sde's group made multiple hybrid translations, not only by combining Sanskrit and Chinese sources but also by revising pre-existing Tibetan translations to create new renderings. The reason that the Chinese sources were not mentioned in the colophon may be the same as why Maitreya Tib II was excluded from the Tibetan Canons. It was more common for the Tibetan translation putatively originating in Sanskrit to be preserved as the 'classical' version. The preference for translations from Sanskrit can also be understood as a strategy to raise the prestige of Tibetan Buddhism, as Tibetans styled themselves the direct successors of Indian Buddhism.

2. Upāyakauśalyasūtra

The doctrine of "skill in means" (Skt. *upāyakauśalya,* Tib. *thabs la mkhas pa*) is crucial to Mahāyāna salvific ideology. It arises from the idea that wisdom is embodied in one's behavior towards ordinary beings rather than the mere grasping of abstract doctrinal conceptions, and pays specific attention to soteriological functions of Buddhism.[40] The Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, having realised that most common people were "cloaked" in "habitual tendencies" (Skt. *vāsanā*, Tib. *bag chags*), would sometimes utilise seemingly deceptive methods to illustrate profound teachings in order to liberate ordinary beings from saṃsāra. The famous "burning house" parable in the Lotus Sūtra is a good example.

The *Upāyakauśalyasūtra* is an early Mahāyāna sūtra that exemplifies this concept through the Buddha's answer to questions posed by Bodhisattva Jñānottara. In this text, the Buddha expounds

---

[40]   Silk 2007; Schroeder 2004: 3; Pye 1978.

on the meanings and implications of "skill in means," and attempts to dispel misinterpretations of Buddhahood.[41] In practical terms, this sūtra was intended to help maintain the Bodhisattva ethic, and to rally Buddhist communities away from a crisis of values by revealing the Bodhisattva's noble intentions behind seemingly improper behaviors.

The Sanskrit version of this text survives only in four short segments in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (abbr. Śik). The sūtra was also preserved in three Chinese (T 310–18, T 345, and T 346) and two Tibetan (D 82 and D 261) translations.[42] The earliest Chinese translation *Huishang pusa wen Dashanquan Jing*《慧上菩薩問大善權經》 (T 345, abbr. Upāya Chin I) was made by Dharmarakṣa in 285CE.[43] The second, T 310–38 the *Dasheng Fangbian Hui*《大乘方便會》(abbr. Upāya Chin II) was translated by Nandi in the Eastern *Jin* Dynasty (317–420CE) and included in the Chinese Ratnakūṭa. The last recension is T 346 the *Foshuo Dafangguang Shanqiaofangbian Jing*《佛說 大方廣善巧方便經》 (abbr. Upāya Chin III). It was rendered by Dānapāla around the end of the 10th century, much later than the other two Chinese versions. The original sources of the three Chinese versions are different: apart from containing divergent names of personages／places and disparities in episode ordering, each of the three Chinese versions contains certain narratives that are not shared by the other two.

The Tibetan translation D 261 (abbr. Upāya Tib I) is titled *Thabs mkhas pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.* Its colophon contains no record of its translators,[44] but Tatz in his English translation ascribed it to the translator Chos grub, and asserted that it was translated from Upāya Chin I. Tatz referred to the *Derge Kanjur Catalog* (*dkar chag*) for support; however, this catalog clearly indicates that the translator's colophon of this text has been lost (*'gyur byang med pa rnams bzhugs so* ‖ 132a5).[45]

---

41   Tatz 1994.

42   It is possible that a third Tibetan *Upāyakauśalyasūtra* existed but has been lost.The section of "Mahāyāna sūtras with less than ten *bam pos*" (*Theg pa chen po'i mdo sde sna tshogs la bam po bcu man chad*) of the *lDan dkar ma* registers one text named *Thabs la mkhas pa theg pa chen po* (No. 173) with the length of 300 ślokas (one bam po). The same title associated with the same one-*bam po* length can also be found in the *'Phang thang ma* (No. 152) and in Bu ston's *Chos 'byung* (No. 343). It is shorter than Upāya Tib II (two bam po). See Kawagoe 2005: 13; Nishoka 1980: 75.

43   See T 2034 *Lidai Sanbao Ji*《歷代三寶紀》Vol.6, 62c4; Tsukamoto 1985: 208.

44   The colophon contains no mention of translationship: *thabs mkhas pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo rdzogs so* ‖ ‖ *shlo ka drug brgya ste bam po gnyis* ‖ ‖

45   Tatz 1994: 17. It might be possible that Tatz confused this sūtra with another sūtra of a similar title, i.e. D 353 *Thabs la mkhas pa chen po sangs rgyas kyi drin lan bsab pa'i mdo,* Chin.《大方便佛報恩經》. In the *Derge Kanjur Catalog* (136a6–7), the

The Tibetan D 82 (abbr. Upāya Tib II), collected into the Tibetan Ratnakūṭa, is titled *Sangs rgyas thams cad kyi gsang chen thabs la mkhas pa byang chub sems dpa' ye shes dam pas zhus pa'i le'u zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*. According to its colophon, it was translated and refined by Dānaśīla, Karmavarma and Ye shes sde based on the "new language."[46] It is more than twice as long as the first Tibetan version, and Tatz claimed that Tib II is of later origin because it displayed the textual expansion characteristic of later works.[47] Although Upāya Chin II and Tibetan D 82 both exist in the Ratnakūṭa collection, they differ significantly from each other.

Philologically speaking, we can hardly find any convincing evidence that Upāya Tib I was translated from Chinese. The gaps between the above Tibetan versions and Chinese versions are quite large in textual comparison (which, unfortunately, cannot be reproduced here due to space limitations).

Compared to the Chinese parallels, both Tibetan versions are closer to the extant counterparts in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. One supporting clue can be found in the sermon where the Bodhisattva says he would choose to create a store of merit for a being even if this act would constitute a transgression and make himself suffer in hell.[48] The parallels from the above versions are cited below:

> Skt. Śik: *yathārūpayāpattyāpannayā kalpaśatasahasraṃ niraye **pacyeta*** (such a sin as would cause him to be cooked in hell for a hundred thousand ages; Bendall 1902: 167. l.12.)[49]
> Tib. Śik:[50] *ltung ba ji lta bu byung ba bskal pa brgya stong du sems can dmyal bar **'tsho bar** 'gyur ba* (such a sin as causes him to persist in the hells for hundreds and thousands of eons; 93b5)
> Upāya Tib I: *de lta bu'i ltung ba byung bas bskal pa brgya stong du sems can dmyal bar **btso bar** gyur kyang* (such a sin would cause him to be cooked in hell for a hundred thousand eons.)

Thabs la mkhas pa chen po sangs rgyas kyi drin lan bsab pa'i mdo is recorded as a translation from Chinese; Chos grub is mentioned in the next line as the translator of the *Legs nyes kyi rgyu 'bras bstan pa zhes bya ba'i mdo*.

46 *rgya gar gyi mkhan po dā na shī la dang karma warma dang | zhu chen gyi lotstsha ba ban de ye shes sdes bsgyur cing zhus te skad gsar chad kyis kyang bcos nas gtan la phab pa | sho lo ka stong nyis brgya sum cu mchis ||* (70b6–7)

47 Tatz 1994: 17.

48 Upāya Tib I 287b6–7; Upāya Tib II 37a1–3; Tatz 1994: 33.

49 The full sentence is as follows: *yadi bodhisatva ekasya satvasya kuśalamūlaṃ saṃjanayettathārūpāṃ cāpattimāpadyeta yathārūpayāpattyāpannayā kalpaśatasahasraṃ niraye pacyeta | utsoḍhavyameva bhagavan bodhisatvenāpattimāpattuṃ tacca nairayikaṃ duṣkhaṃ , na tveva tasyaikasya satvasya kuśalaṃ parityaktumiti ||*

50 Derge Tanjur No. 3940, mdo 'grel (dbu ma), khi, 3a–194b.

Upāya Tib II: *nongs pa ji lta bu byung bas bskal pa 'bum gyi bar du sems can dmyal ba chen por __sreg par__ 'gyur yang* (such an offense would cause him to be burnt in hell for a hundred thousand eons)

Upāya Chin I: 若似犯罪,若實犯罪,於百千劫墮大地獄.

Upāya Chin II: 從其所生,輒當獲之信於善權,墮大地獄至于百劫.

Upāya Chin III: 若如所起罪垢心者,當於百千劫中受地獄苦.

The two Upāya Tib texts are very close to the Sanskrit parallel. Upāya Tib I is almost identical to the Tibetan Śik except for one word *btso ba* "cook" (√ *pac*).[51] It is possible that *'tsho ba* and *btso ba* are a resultative and causative pair.[52] Another possibility is that *'tsho ba* might be an undocumented form or a transcription error for *btso* (the future stem), or *'tshod* (the present stem for *btso*).[53] Whereas the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions explicitly describe the suffering in hell as "being cooked," the Chinese translation never mentions it. The gap between the Tibetan and the Chinese leaves us with little grounds for agreeing with Tatz's assertion that Upāya Tib I is translated from Chinese.

As for the chronology of Upāya Tib I and II, I suppose that Upāya Tib I is of earlier origin. The two share the same sentence structures, but use interchangeable vocabularies. It seems plausible that one version was revised based on the other. The term *btso ba* "cook" in Upāya Tib I is a translation from Sanskrit (√ *pac*) but Upāya Tib II uses the term *sreg pa* "to burn." My supposition is that the editors of Upāya Tib II, in order to create a seemingly different text, substituted *sreg pa* for *btso ba*. The same occurs with Tib II's term *nongs pa* "faults" which is the synonym for Tib I's *ltung ba* "backsliding" (Skt. *āpatti*). My hypothesis can explain why Upāya Tib II usually utilises imprecise terms. Therefore, it is possible that Tib II is a revision based on Tib I, a contention for which I will provide additional evidence below.

Generally speaking, two recensions of the Tibetan *Upāyakauśalyasūtra* resemble each other, and in some places even track each other word for word. Below, in order to illustrate the affinity between the two Tibetan versions, I compare two paragraphs from each. The first correspondent synonyms are written in **bold** and the second group of synonyms are written in ***italic bold***; the following groups of synonyms alternate between **bold** and *italic*

---

[51] "Cooking" is a root metaphor in Vedic sacrificial cosmos, as argued by Malamoud (1996: 23–53). This ritual metaphor was widely accepted by Buddhist literature. See Gummer 2014.

[52] Many thanks to my peer reviewer for reminding me of this possibility and Nathan Hill's suggestion on it.

[53] Hill 2010: 242.

bold. Lines where the contents diverge are <u>underlined</u>; sentences without any marks are where the two texts are virtually identical.

Paragraph A (284b5–7; 32a7–b3)

Upāya Tib I	Upāya Tib II
rigs kyi bu gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' thabs mkhas pa ni **nam zhig** *shes rab rmongs pa can du red* na yang de ni bdag la **yi mi gsod** kyi *gzengs bstod par byed do* ǀ ǀ **chung ngu** na rtsa ba bzhi pa'i tshigs su bcad pa <u>gcig kha ton du 'don na yang</u>	rigs kyi bu gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen pa'i thabs la mkhas pa ni **gang gi tshe** *blo rtul bar gyur* na yang de bdag nyid khyad du **gsod par mi byed** cing ǀ *zhum par mi byed pa* de **tha na** tshig bzhi pa'i tshigs su bcad pa gcig <u>tsam la yang 'jug par byed cing de 'di ltar so sor rtog par yang byed de ǀ</u>
rtsa ba bzhi pa'i tshigs su bcad pa gcig gi don gang yin pa gsung rab tu gtogs pa thams cad kyi don kyang de yin no ǀ zhes de de ltar slob cing	tshig bzhi pa'i tshigs su bcad pa gcig po 'di'i don gang yin pa de ni gsung rab tu gtogs pa thams cad kyi don yin no zhes so sor rtog par byed do ǀ ǀ
des tshigs su bcad pa de kha ton du byas nas	des de ltar tshig bzhi pa'i tshigs su bcad pa gcig kha ton <u>du bslabs nas zhum pa med pa'i sems kyis snying rje chen po bskyed de ǀ rnyed pa dang ǀ bkur sti dang ǀ grags pa 'dod pa med pas grong dang ǀ grong khyer dang ǀ grong rdal dang ǀ yul 'khor dang ǀ rgyal po'i pho brang 'khor dag tu skye bo mang po la tshig bzhi pa'i tshigs su bcad pa de rgya cher yang dag par ston par byed cing 'di ltar smon lam 'debs par yang byed de</u> ǀ sems can *gang su*
sems can *gang ji snyed* dag gis bdag gi rtsa ba bzhi pa'i tshigs su bcad pa 'di thos pa de <u>thams cad sangs rgyas kyi spobs pa thob par shog cig ǀ ces de ltar ma zhum pa'i sems</u> kyis smon lam 'debs te ǀ	dag gis bdag gi tshig bzhi pa'i tshigs su bcad pa 'di thos par gyur pa de dag <u>thams cad bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu nges par gyur cig ces</u> smon lam 'debs par yang byed do ǀ ǀ
de dge ba'i rtsa ba des sems can thams cad kyi thos pa <u>mtha' med pa dpe med pa zil gyis gnon</u> cing sangs rgyas kyi spobs pa yang **len par byed do** ǀ ǀ	de dge ba'i rtsa ba thabs la mkhas pas yongs su zin pa des sems can thams cad <u>kun dga' bo ltar mang du thos par 'gyur</u> zhing sangs rgyas kyi spobs pa nyid kyang **'thob par** 'gyur te ǀ rigs kyi bu de yang byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po'i thabs la mkhas pa yin no ǀ ǀ

Paragraph B (284b7–285a1; 32b5–7)

rigs kyi bu gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' thabs mkhas pa ni *nam zhig gal te*
brgya la dbul por gyur na | de'i tshe na de *chung ngu na* gzhan gyi las kyang byas nas **zas gzar bu gang thogs** te *sems ma zhum pas* dge 'dun nam gang zag la **sbyin par byed do** ||
byin nas kyang 'di ltar
slob ste | bcom ldan 'das kyis sems *che ba'i phyir*
sbyin pa **che bar 'gyur** ro zhes gsungs kyis bdag gi
sbyin pa chung ngu
zin kyang thams cad mkhyen pa nyid kyi sems ni dpag tu med pa'o snyam nas

rigs kyi bu gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po'i thabs la mkhas pa ni *gal te brgya la* **brgya lam na** dbul por gyur na yang des *tha na* gzhan gyi las kyang byas te | **kha zas nal ze gang tsam yang blangs** nas *zhum pa med pa'i sems* kyis dge 'dun nam | gang zag la **'bul bar yang byed do** ||
phul nas kyang de 'di ltar **so sor rtog par** byed de | bcom ldan 'das kyis sems *rgya chen pos* byin na sbyin pa yang **rgya chen por 'gyur** ro zhes gsungs pas na 'di ltar bdag gi sbyin par bya ba'i chos 'di ni chud *mod kyi* | thams cad mkhyen pa nyid kyi sems kyis byin pas dpag tu med par 'gyur ro snyam du so sor rtog par byed do ||

On the basis of this type of evidence, we must conclude that it is almost impossible that these two translations were performed independently. The differences in vocabulary highlighted above can best be explained by the proposition that the translators of the later version deliberately altered the terms from the earlier one through synonyms, perhaps in order to generate the appearance of a new and original translation. As shown above, it is more likely that Upāya Tib II was revised based on the Upāya Tib I. The later text, when translated from its own source, kept the basic sentence structure of the preexisting one, but altered many terms in order to exhibit difference, or, in other cases, to supplement, correct, or improve the earlier version based on its own source text.

A similar case of a hybrid translation can also be found in the *Suvarṇaprabhāsasūtra*. This sūtra survives in three complete Tibetan versions in the Kanjurs: the first, D 557, is the shortest and was translated from Sanskrit; the second, D 556, is longer and was ascribed to Jinamitra, Śīlendrabodhi and Ye shes sde in its colophon; and the third, D 555, was translated from the Chinese version of Yijing. Several scholars have already noticed that D 556, ascribed to Ye shes sde, was a revision rather than a wholly new translation, as a large portion of its content is identical to D 557. Recently, Michael Radich has discovered that the "trikāya" section in D 556 was

translated from Chinese rather than from Sanskrit.[54] Thus, in contrast to the conventional wisdom that Ye shes sde's translation group worked directly from Sanskrit texts, it can be proven that they performed hybrid translations, combining Sanskrit and Chinese sources as demonstrated by the *Suvarṇaprabhāsasūtra*, or even revising preexisting texts to make a new translation, as in the case of the Upāya Tib II.

The above cases shed some light on the problem of oversimplified conceptions of early Tibetan translation practice. They demonstrate that early Tibetan translators, specially Ye shes sde's group, sometimes did not render directly from a Sanskrit original. Translations alleged to be from Sanskrit may be hybrids drawing on several source materials. Although later-period Tibetans ascribed more authority and prestige to Indic texts, early Tibetan translators would rely on the parallel Chinese source even if they had access to a Sanskrit source. The difficulty of obtaining a complete Indic text and the need to refer to Chinese recensions to obtain a more complete contextual understanding likely explains these practices.

3. Conclusion

Notwithstanding the long-standing Tibetan tradition of colophons, the true circumstances of early translationship have been lost during transmission. This is not only because of the lack of precise information in colophons/catalogs due to textual replacement after repetitive translations of the same text. It can also be attributed to intentional textual manipulation stemming from political or religious preferences.

The case studies of the above two sūtras offer a hypothesis about the *modus operandi* in early Tibetan translation which challenges the alleged translationship recorded in Tibetan colophons. The Tibetan Buddhists translated Buddhist texts not only from Sanskrit but also from Chinese and other languages. It was common for a single Buddhist text to be translated multiple times from both Sanskrit and Chinese. Although the translations with Chinese origin have been marginalised in later Tibetan history, there is ample evidence from imperial catalogs, old Dunhuang manuscripts, and fragmentary information scattered in some Tibetan historiographies, to support the popularity of the practice of translating from Chinese Buddhist texts in early Tibetan Buddhism. In most cases the translation from Chinese was earlier than the parallel rendering from Sanskrit. The

---

[54]   Radich 2015.

Tibetan translation team who were responsible for Sanskrit translation would refer to the accessible Chinese parallels or other pre-existing Tibetan translations during translation. The common statement of "translating from Sanskrit (*rgya las bsgyur*)" in Tibetan colophons should be revisited because it might mean that a Sanskrit text acted as the main source instead of the exclusive source.

The theory that all translations by Ye shes sde's group were rendered solely from Sanskrit should be discarded since it is quite clear that Ye shes sde used Chinese texts as a reference. From the historical perspective, Tibetan Buddhists in the *phyi dar* tended to exaggerate the Indian legacies while minimising the influence from China. In order to make use of Buddhism to build their own identity, Tibetans preferred to regard themselves as the direct successors of Indian Buddhism. Further surveys of early Tibetan translation will uncover more intricacies of the dynamic development of Tibetan religion and history.

Bibliography and Abbreviations

sBa bzhed: 1982. *sBa gsal snang gi bzhed pa*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

sBa bzhed phyogs bsgrigs: 2009. *sBa bzhed phyogs bsgrigs.* Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

Bendall, C., ed. 1902. *Śikṣāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching*. St. Petersburg: Russian Academy of Sciences.

D = Derge Kanjur; the classical Tibetan texts cited without comment are all taken from the Derge edition. All the Derge texts mentioned here were obtained from TBRC.

Davidson, Ronald M. 2004. "The Kingly Cosmogonic Narrative and Tibetan Histories: Indian Origins, Tibetan Space, and the *bKa' 'chems ka khol ma* Synthesis." *Lungta* 16, 64–83.

Eimer, Helmut. 2002. "On the Structure of the Tibetan Kanjur." In *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism: PIATS 2000,* edited by Helmut Eimer and David Germano, 57–72. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2012. *A Catalogue of the Kanjur Fragment from Bathang Kept in the Newark Museum*. Wien: Universität Wien.

Gummer, Natalie D. 2014. "Sacrificial Sūtras: Mahāyāna Literature and the South Asian Ritual Cosmos." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 82(4), 1091–1126.

Guo, Xiliang. 1986. 漢字古音手册 *[Manual on Chinese Ancient Phonology]*. Beijing: Peking University Press.

Harrison, Paul. 1996. "A Brief History of the Tibetan bKa' 'gyur." In *Tibetan Literature. Studies in Genre*, edited by Jose I. Cabecon and Roger R. Jackson, 70–94. Ithaka: Snow Lion.

Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid. 2008. *Die Lhan kar ma: ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte*. Wien: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Hill, Nathan W. 2010. *A Lexicon of Tibetan Verb Stems as Reported by the Grammatical Tradition*. München: Kommission für Zentral- und Ostasiatische Studien, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

———. 2011. "The Allative, Locative, and Terminative Cases (la-don) in the Old Tibetan Annals." In *New Studies of the Old Tibetan Documents*, edited by Yoshiro Imaeda, et. al., 3–38. Tokyo: ILCAA.

Imaeda, Yoshiro. 1975. "Documents Tibétain de Touen-houang concernant le Concile du Tibet." *Journal Asiatique*, 125–146.

IOL San = Sanskrit manuscripts in the India Office Library discovered by Aurel Stein.

ITJ = Tibetan manuscripts in the India Office Library found at Dunhuang and collected by Aurel Stein.

Karmay, Samten Gyaltsen. 1989. *The Great Perfection (rdzogs chen): A Philosophical and Meditative Teaching in Tibetan Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2007. *The Great Perfection: A Philosophical and Meditative Teaching of Tibetan Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill.

Kawagoe, Eishin. 2005. *Dkar chag 'Phang thang ma*. Sendai-shi: Tohoku Indo-Chibetto Kenkyukai.

Lee, Yu-Min. 1983. "The Maitreya Cult and its Art in Early China."

Ph.D. thesis 8400244, The Ohio State University.

Legittimo, Elsa I. 2010. "Reopening the Maitreya-files–Two Almost Identical Early Maitreya Sūtra Translations in the Chinese Canon." *JIABS* 31(1–2), 251–293.

Malamoud, Charles. 1996. *Cooking the World: Ritual and Thought in Ancient India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Matsumura, Hisashi. 1993. "Marginalia to the Sanskrit Fragments of Some Buddhist Texts." *Central Asiatic Journal* 37, 120–149.

Nishioka, Soshū. 1980. "Index to the Catalogue Section of Bu-ston's *History of Buddhism* I." *Annual Report of Institute for the Study of Cultural Exchange*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Cultural Exchange.

Nobel, Johannes. 1944. *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra: Das Goldglanz-Sūtra: Die tibetischen Übersetzungen, mit einer Tafel*. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1958. *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra. I-Tsing's chinesische Version und ihre tibetische Übersetzung*. Leiden: Brill.

Okimoto, Katsumi 沖本克己. 1976. "チベット譯《二入四行論》について" [The Tibetan Translation of *Erh-ju-ssu-hsing-lun*]. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 24(2), 999–99.

———. 1975-7. "bSam yas の宗論(一),(二),(三)" [Bsam yas no Shūron 1–3]. *Japanese Association for Tibetan Studies* 21, 5–8; 22, 4–8; 23, 5–8.

Oetke, Claus. 1977. *Die aus dem Chinesischen übersetzten tibetischen Versionen des Suvarṇaprabhāsasūtra*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

PT = (Dunhuang manuscript) Pelliot tibétain

Pasang Wangdu and Hildegard Diemberger. 2000. *dBa' bzhed: the Royal Narrative Concerning the Bringing of the Buddha's Doctrine to Tibet*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Pye, Michael. 1978. *Skilful Means: A Concept in Mahayana Buddhism*. London: Duckworth.

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), 245–70.

Richardson, Hugh. 1952. *Ancient Historical Edicts at Lhasa and the Mu Tsung/Khri Gtsug Lde Brtsan Treaty of A.D. 821–822 from the Inscription at Lhasa*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.

van Schaik, Sam. 2014. *The Tibetan Chan Manuscripts: A Complete Descriptive Catalogue of Tibetan Chan Texts in the Dunhuang Manuscript Collections*. Bloomington: The Sinor Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies.

———. 2015. *Tibetan Zen: Discovering a Lost Tradition*. Boston: Snow Lion.

van Schaik, Sam and Kazushi Iwao. 2008. "Fragments of the 'Testament of Ba' from Dunhuang." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 128(3), 477–487.

Schroeder, John W. 2001. *Skillful Means: The Heart of Buddhist Compassion*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Schuessler, Axel. 2009. *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Silk, Jonathan A. 1996. "Notes on the History of the Yongle Kanjur." In *Suhṛllekhāḥ: Festgabe für Helmut Eimer (Indica et Tibetica 28)*, 153–200. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica.

———. 2007. Mahayana. In *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Accessed March 31, 2016. http://www.britannica.com/topic/Mahayana.

———. *forthcoming*. The Ten Virtues of Loudly Invoking the Name of Amitābha.

Silk, Jonathan and Channa Li. *forthcoming*. *Tibetan Translations of Chinese Sutras*.

Simonsson, Nils. 1957. *Indo-tibetische Studien.* Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksell.

Shen, Weirong. 2011. "Reviews of the Latest Studies on Dunhuang Tibetan Buddhist Literature, Tabo Monastery Manuscripts and rNal 'byor chen por bsgom pa'i don." In *Studies of Dunhuang Literature, Archaeology and Art*, 339–53. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.

Stein, Rolf A. 1961. *Une chronique ancienne des bSam-yas: sBa-bzhed*. Paris: Institut des hautes études chinoises.

Stein, Rolf A. and Arthur P. McKeown. 2010. *Rolf Stein's Tibetica antiqua with additional materials*. Leiden: Brill.

T = Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō

Tatz, Mark. 1994. *The Skill in Means: Upāyakauśalya Sūtra*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Tong Jinhua and Huang Bufan. 1990. *Baxie (sBa bzhed): Its Translation and Annotation with the Original Text*. Khren tu'u: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

Tsukamoto, Zenryu. 1985. *A History of Early Chinese Buddhism: From its Introduction to the Death of Hui-Yüan*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Ueyama, Daishun 上山大峻. 1968. "チベット譯<楞伽師資記>ついて" [Chibettoyaku 'Ryōga shishi ki' ni tsuite]. 佛教文献の研究: 佐藤教授停年記念 [*Bukkyū bunken no kenkyū: Satō kyōjū teinen kinen*] 25–26, 191–209.

———. 1974, 1983, 1987. "敦煌出土チベット文禪資料の研究" [A Study on the Manuscripts of Dhyāna Found in Tun-huang I, II, III]. *Bulletin of Buddhist Cultural Institute Ryukoku University* 13, 1–11; 22, 19–60; 26, 37–51.

———. 1990. 敦煌仏教の研究 [*Studies on Dunhuang Buddhism*]. Kyoto: hōzōkan.

de la Vallee Poussin, L. 1911. "Documents Sanscrits de la Seconde Collection M. A. Stein (Continued from the July Journal, p. 777)." *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1063–1079.

Wu, Qiyu. 1984. 大蕃国大德·三蔵法師·法成伝考 [*Research on the Tibetan Bhadanta, Tripitaka Master Chos grub*], 383–414. Tokyo: Daitō.

❖