



## BuddhistRoad

Dynamics in Buddhist Networks in Eastern Central Asia 6th–14th Centuries

### BuddhistRoad Paper 1.3

---

---

# TOWARD A HISTORY OF CHÖDRUP'S (FL. FIRST HALF OF 9TH C., TIB. CHOS GRUB, CHIN. FACHENG 法成) MONASTIC ACTIVITIES: AN INTRODUCTION AND A WORKING CHRONOLOGY

CHANNA LI





## BUDDHISTROAD PAPER

Peer reviewed

ISSN: 2628-2356

DOI: 10.46586/rub.br.304

BuddhistRoad Papers are licensed under the Creative Commons—Attribution NonCommercial—NoDerivates 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).

You can find this publication also on the BuddhistRoad project homepage:

<https://buddhistroad.ceres.rub.de/en/publications/>

Please quote this paper as follows:

**Li, Channa, “Toward a History of Chödruṅ’s (fl. First Half of 9th C., Tib. Chos grub, Chin, Facheng 法成) Monastic Activities: An Introduction and a Working Chronology,” *BuddhistRoad Paper 1.3* (2024).**

### CONTACT:

Principal Investigator: Prof. Dr. Carmen Meinert

BuddhistRoad | Ruhr-Universität Bochum | Center for Religious Studies (CERES)

Universitätsstr. 90a | 44789 Bochum | Germany

Phone: +49 (0)234 32-21683 | Fax: +49 (0) 234/32- 14 909

Email: [BuddhistRoad@rub.de](mailto:BuddhistRoad@rub.de) | Email: [carmen.meinert@rub.de](mailto:carmen.meinert@rub.de)

Website: <https://buddhistroad.ceres.rub.de/>

BuddhistRoad is a project of



Centrum für Religionswissenschaftliche Studien  
Center for Religious Studies

RUHR  
UNIVERSITÄT  
BOCHUM

RUB

### SPONSORS:



European Research Council

Established by the European Commission



This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 725519).

TOWARD A HISTORY OF CHÖDRUP’S (FL. FIRST HALF OF  
9TH C., TIB. CHOS GRUB, CHIN. FACHENG 法成) MONASTIC  
ACTIVITIES: AN INTRODUCTION AND A WORKING  
CHRONOLOGY\*

CHANNA LI

*Abstract*

Building on previous studies, especially those in Japanese and Chinese, this paper is intended as an introduction to Go Chödrup’s (fl. first half of 9th c., Tib. ’Go Chos grub, Chin. Facheng 法成) monastic career through a wide-ranging survey of primary sources from Dunhuang. Apart from offering an outline of Chödrup’s translations from Chinese into Tibetan, which are relatively better known to Buddhist scholars, this paper further conducts a preliminary study of Chödrup’s translations from Tibetan and Sanskrit into Chinese. This part of the research, presented in section 2, highlights Chödrup’s mastery of the three languages and his efforts in promoting the cross-cultural fertilisation of diverse Buddhist teachings in Dunhuang. Section 3, devoted to the commentaries and lecture notes produced by Chödrup, casts a spotlight on his identity as a Buddhist scholar who integrated various doctrinal schools in contemporary India, Tibetan, and Chinese Buddhist circles into his own teachings. The two active intellectual lineages of Vasubandhu’s (3rd–4th c.?) Yogācāra teachings—one being Xuanzang (600/602–664, 玄奘)-Wonch’uk (613–696, 圓測)-Tanguang (ca. 700–ca. 785, 曇曠) lineage, the other that of Kamalaśīla (ca. 740–ca. 795) and other intermediate Indian masters (such as Jñānadatta)—converged in Chödrup’s oeuvre. The survey of Chödrup’s works also yields a working chronology of his monastic activities, which provides a clearer historical context for these works and more vividly reflects the localisation of Buddhism in Dunhuang as part of a larger network of Buddhism in Eastern Central Asia involving the in-depth interaction and synthesis of diverse Buddhist teachings ranging from Indian to Tibetan and Sinitic influences.

---

\* Part of the research was conducted with funding from FWF Esprit Project, no.125.



## 1. Introduction

For more than thirty years of his academic life, Ueyama Daishūn (上山大峻) has dedicated himself to the study of Dunhuang Buddhism and produced works that opened the field. His publication of *Tonkō bukkō no kenkyū* 敦煌仏教の研究 [Studies on Dunhuang Buddhism] in 1991 can be regarded as an effort to systematise his main views on Dunhuang Buddhism: Buddhists in ancient Dunhuang did not simply gather various teachings from the Chinese, Tibetan, Central Asian, or Indian Buddhist world; instead, Dunhuang Buddhism encompassed all these elements while developing a distinct religious system (or systems) through the composition and circulation of unique texts,<sup>1</sup> the assimilation of different doctrines and practices (e.g., the synthesis of the Chan tradition with Tantrism; the fertile exegetical traditions), and active intellectual networks (those surrounding Tankuang (ca. 700–ca. 785, 曇曠) and Go Chödrup (fl. first half of 9th c., Tib. 'Go Chos grub)). Thus, a study of Chödrup, a monk-scholar with a fluid biography and high degree of intellectual creativity, is an excellent case study illustrating the exchanges within the Buddhist network of Eastern Central Asia. This network has been extensively researched, particularly through the BuddhistRoad Project, which opened the field much further, has significantly enhanced our understanding of their complexities and significance, and overcame the older fragmentation into sub-disciplines like Dunhuang Studies. As the previous research showed,<sup>2</sup> Dunhuang served as a prominent centre within this network.

Indeed, for Dunhuang (敦煌), a centre of cross-cultural fertilisation in the Eastern Central Asian network, it is neither easy nor always fruitful to define its wide swath of Buddhist elements using ethnical, geographical, or even linguistic labels (such as Chinese Chan or Tibetan Tantrism, or the identification that Chödrup was Chinese or Tibetan). Such labels are misleading in that they attempt to categorise highly hybrid traditions based

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, the *Aparimitayurnamasūtra*, the *Śālistamba* commentaries, and the *Caturdharmakanāmahāyānasūtra* commentaries.

<sup>2</sup> For instance, Henrik H. Sørensen, “Buddhism in Dunhuang,” in *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism. Volume Four. History: Part Two: Central and East Asia*, ed. Richard Bowring and Vincent Eltschinger (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2023), 27a–42b. Ueyama Daishūn 上山大峻, *Tonkō bukkō no kenkyū* 敦煌仏教の研究 [Studies on Dunhuang Buddhism] (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1990), 3–6.

only on where they originally came from, losing track of how these traditions developed in Eastern Central Asian nodes such as Dunhuang's highly integrated communities. The merging of Chan and Tantra in the ninth or tenth century is a prominent example, as both had developed into traditions distinct from their earlier, 'original' versions, fusing diverse cross-cultural and multilingual elements into their own local complexes, resulting in highly conflated new traditions such as Tibetan Chan.<sup>3</sup>

Dunhuang's intellectual tradition, so far understudied, is another paradigm of the cross-fertilisation of Buddhism at Dunhuang. As has been highlighted in Ueyama's aforementioned work, the teachings and compositions of scholar-monks such as Tankuang and Chödrup are examples of Dunhuang's distinctive intellectual circle. Tankuang's teachings were mainly inherited from the Ximing (西明) lineage of Xuanzang's (600/602–664, 玄奘) Faxiang Yogācāra school (法相宗),<sup>4</sup> and already exerted an influence upon contemporary Dunhuang and Central Tibet.<sup>5</sup> In the case of Chödrup, we can more clearly see the

---

<sup>3</sup> Recent studies include Henrik H. Sørensen, "Tibetan Tantra and Chinese Esoteric Buddhism in the Melting Pot: A Study of a Chinese Recension of the Twenty-Eight Vajra Precepts," *BuddhistRoad Paper* 2.2 (2019); Amanda Goodman, "The Vajragarbhā Bodhisattva Three-Syllable Visualisation: A Chinese Buddhist Sādhana Text from Tenth Century Dunhuang," *BuddhistRoad Paper* 2.7 (2022); Jacob P. Dalton, "Bridging Yoga and Mahāyoga: Samaya in Early Tantric Buddhism," in *Buddhism in Central Asia II—Practices and Rituals, Visual and Material Transfer*, ed. Yukiyo Kasai and Henrik H. Sørensen (Leiden: Brill, 2022), 270–287; Lewis Doney, "On the Margins: Between Beliefs and Doctrines within Tibetan-Ruled Dunhuang Scribal Culture," *BuddhistRoad Paper* 1.6 (2023); Carmen Meinert, "People, Places, Texts, and Topics: Another Look at the Larger Context of the Spread of Chan Buddhism in Eastern Central Asia during the Tibetan Imperial and Post-Imperial Period (7th–10th C.)," in *Buddhism in Central Asia III—Impacts of Non-Buddhist Influences, Doctrines*, ed. Lewis Doney, Carmen Meinert, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Yukiyo Kasai (Leiden: Brill, 2023), 257–291. See also Sam van Schaik, *Tibetan Zen: Discovering A Lost Tradition* (Snow Lion: Boston, 2015).

<sup>4</sup> The Ximing sublineage of the Faxiang Yogācāra school was headed by the Korean monk Wonch'uk. The other sublineage of the Faxiang Yogācāra school was headed by Kuiji (632–682, 窥基, alias Dashengji 大乘基 or Ji 基), the abbot of Da ci'en Monastery (大慈恩寺). Cf. Monika Guerra-Glarner, "Le commentaire de Tankuang sur l'Eveil à la Foi dans le Grand Véhicule: la probable influence de Wonhyo," *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 71.1 (2017): 187–210; John Powers, "Lost in China, Found in Tibet: How Wonch'uk Became the Author of the Great Chinese Commentary," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 15.1 (1992): 95. For a general study of Tankuang's life and teachings, cf. Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 17–79.

<sup>5</sup> The text *Dasheng ershi'er wen* 大乘二十二問 [Twenty-two Dialogues of Mahāyāna] was composed by Tankuang to answer the Tibetan emperor's questions, reflecting his



confluence of Buddhist teachings from both Chinese and Indian-Tibetan traditions: Vasubandhu's (3rd–4th c.?) teachings were transmitted to Chödrup in two lineages, one being the Xuanzang-Wonch'uk (613–696, 圓測)-Tankuang lineage, the other that of Kamalaśīla (ca. 740–ca. 795) and other intermediate Indian masters (such as Jñānadatta). Chödrup's compositions therefore contain dynamic philosophical dialogues and reflect a synthesis of different Buddhist traditions ranging from India, to local developments in Eastern Central Asia, to Central Tibet, to China, in a manner quite contrary to the stereotypical account of the Samyé Debate, in which there were intense rivalries between the Chinese side and that of Kamalaśīla.

With this being said, Chödrup's significant role in Buddhist intellectual history was primarily important in Eastern Central Asia, including sites such as Dunhuang and Ganzhou, as visible in the Dunhuang manuscripts. In the transmitted histories in Central Tibet and Central China, however, he was largely forgotten<sup>6</sup> until the rediscovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts. The major contributions to the reconstruction of Chödrup's personal history have been made by scholars in Japan and China. As early as 1967 and

---

mastery of the Yogācāra and Chan traditions. This text is found in P. 2960, P. 2287, and S. 2074, just to name a few. Cf. Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 32–34, 42–57; Carmen Meinert, “The Conjunction of Chinese *Chan* and Tibetan *Rdzogs Chen* Thought: Reflections on the Tibetan Dunhuang Manuscripts IOL Tib J. 689–1 and Pt 699,” in *Contributions to the Cultural History of Early Tibet*, ed. Matthew Kapstein and Brandon Dotson (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 248–251; Werner Pachow, “Dasheng ershi'er wen zhi yanjiu 大乘二十二問之研究 [A Study of the *Twenty-two Dialogues on Mahāyāna Buddhism*],” *Zhonghua foxue xuebao* 中華佛學學報 [Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies] 2 (1988): 65–110 (a translation from the English version that is accessible to me); Werner Pachow, “A Study of the *Twenty-Two Dialogues on Mahāyāna Buddhism*,” *Chinese Culture* 20.1 (1979a): 35–64; Werner Pachow, “The Translation of the *Twenty-Two Dialogues on Mahāyāna*,” *Chinese Culture* 20.2 (1979b): 35–110; and Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 43–57. See also Channa Li, “Tankuang and His Work in Tibetan Translation: Revisiting of IOL Tib J 26 and the Mahādeva Narrative,” *T'oung Pao*, forthcoming.

<sup>6</sup> However, Chödrup's name was sporadically attested in Tibetan transmitted sources, especially as that of the translator in the colophons of many Kangyur (Tib. bKa' 'gyur) texts (see Section 2.1 for examples of such colophons). His name also appears in lists of early translators in Tibetan historiographies, such as the *Chos 'byung* [The History of the Teaching] of Butön (1290–1364, Tib. Bu ston). Cf. Janos Szerb, *Bu ston's History of Buddhism in Tibet* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990), 114; *kLong chen Chos 'byung* [The History of the Teaching [as told by] Longchenpa] (Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe raying dpe skrun khang, 1991), 380.

*BuddhistRoad Paper* 1.3. Li, “Toward a History of Chödrup's Monastic Activities”

1968, in the journal *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方學報 [Journal of Oriental Studies],<sup>7</sup> Ueyama had already published a comprehensive monograph in which he provides a remarkably in-depth study of Chödrup based on the available Dunhuang manuscripts and Tibetan canonical records, including the identification of his Chinese and Tibetan names, his translations, his other compositions, and his position among the various Buddhist philosophical schools. The aforementioned *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, although it reproduces major parts of the 1967/1968 publication, contains Ueyama's updated views on how to contextualise this scholar-monk in the milieu of Buddhism in Eastern Central Asia, especially Dunhuang: preceded by a chapter on Tankuang, the chapter on Chödrup demonstrates Ueyama's intention to treat Chödrup as an heir to Tankuang's Ximing-Faxiang lineage. Indeed, Chödrup not only translated the extensive commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana* by the famous Ximing master Wonch'uk,<sup>8</sup> but also adopted the exegetical tradition of 'classification of [the textual] organisation' (Chin. *kepan* 科判<sup>9</sup>) previously used in Wonch'uk<sup>10</sup> and Tankuang's commentaries.<sup>11</sup> It may be noted that Chödrup adopted a title

<sup>7</sup> Ueyama Daishūn 上山大峻, "Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi shamonhōjō no kenkyū (jō) 大蕃國大德三藏法師沙門法成の研究 (上) [Studies on the Great Monk of Tibetan Empire, *Tripiṭakācārya, Śramaṇa Chödrup*]," *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方學報 / *Journal of Oriental Studies*, Kyoto 38 (1967): 133–98; Ueyama Daishūn 上山大峻, "Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi shamonhōjō no kenkyū (ge) 大蕃國大德三藏法師沙門法成の研究 (下) [Studies on the Great Monk of Tibetan Empire, *Tripiṭakācārya, Śramaṇa Chödrup*]," *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方學報 / *Journal of Oriental Studies*, Kyoto 39 (1968): 119–222.

<sup>8</sup> The *dKar chag lHan dkar ma* [The Catalogue from the Court of lHan kar ma] (abbr. LKK), no. 565 *dGongs 'grel gyi 'grel pa* [The Commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana*] = Derge 4016 *dGongs pa zab mo nges par 'grel pa'i mdo rgya cher 'grel pa* [The Extensive Commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana*]. Cf. Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt, *Die Lhan kar ma* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2008), 321; Channa Li, "A Survey of Tibetan Sūtras Translated from Chinese," *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 60 (2021): 209.

<sup>9</sup> For a general study of the classification of [the textual] organisation tradition in Chinese Buddhist texts, cf. Tao Jin, "The Self-Imposed Classification of [Textual] Organization (*Kepan* 科判) of the *Qixinlun*: Some Major Forms and a Few Possible Problems," *Dharma Drum Journal of Buddhist Studies* 21 (2007): 1–39.

<sup>10</sup> Ernst Steinkellner, "Who Is Byang chub rdzu 'phrul? Tibetan and Non-Tibetan Commentaries on the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*: A Survey of the Literature," *Berliner Indologische Studien* 4–5 (1989): 229–251.

<sup>11</sup> For Chödrup's inheritance of Tankuang's classification of [the textual] organisation, cf. Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 112–153.



format ending with the term *kaijue* 開決 (‘exegesis’)<sup>12</sup> for his exegetical compositions, a format that is earlier attested only in Tankuang’s works. On the other hand, Ueyama also highlights Chödrup’s transmission of the Yogācāra-Madhyamaka philosophy from the Indo-Tibetan traditions, such as his exegesis of Kamalaśīla’s commentary on the *Śālistambasūtra* and Jñānadatta’s commentary on the *Ṣaṅmukhīdhāraṇī* (on which see the detailed discussion in section 3).

Another important article dealing with the same corpus of Dunhuang manuscripts was published by Wu Qiyu,<sup>13</sup> who answers essentially the same questions as posed in Ueyama’s 1967–1968 publication.<sup>14</sup> In addition to offering more evidence to concretise Ueyama’s discussions, Wu also endeavours to reconstruct a chronology of Chödrup’s life, notwithstanding some invalid speculations on dating. For the Chinese audience, the most famous study is Wang Yao’s 1994 publication.<sup>15</sup> Based on Ueyama’s previous studies, Wang re-examines Chödrup’s family background and his Buddhist activities, and constructs a catalogue of

<sup>12</sup> Here *kaijue* (literally, ‘opening up and resolving’) as part of the title is possibly an abbreviation for *kaizong yijue* 開宗義決, which literally means ‘resolving [how to] clarify the tenets’ (therefore, ‘exegesis’ is a quite fitting translation). The term *kaizong yijue* is attested, for instance, in the title of Tankuang’s *Dasheng baifa mingmen lun kaizong yijue* 大乘百法明門論開宗義決 [Resolving [How to] Clarify the Tenets of the \*Mahāvānaśatadharmaparakāśamukhaśāstra]. I could not find an earlier usage of *kaijue* in titles, and therefore I doubt this title format was coined by Tankuang as a reflection of its exegetical genre. The word *jue* (決) can carry the connotation of ‘opening up’, especially in the context connected with canals or water. When *kaijue* appears as one term (albeit not common) in the main body of the text, it has meanings such as ‘to show, to teach’ (corresponds to skt. *saṃdarśayati*) and ‘to dispel (doubts)’. See more discussions in Friedrich F. Grohmann 高明道, “Qiantan *kaijue* 淺談「開決」 [A Preliminary Discussion on *Kaijue*],” *Dharma Light Monthly* (2017): 1–6.

<sup>13</sup> Wu Qiyu 吳其昱, “Daibankoku daitoku sanzō hōshi Hōjō denkō 大蕃国大德三藏法師法成伝考 [Studies on the Biography of the Great Monk of the Tibetan Empire, Tripitakācārya Chödrup],” in *Kōza Tonkō 7: Tonkō to Chūgoku bukkyō* 講座敦煌 7: 敦煌と中国仏教 7 [Lectures on Dunhuang Studies 7: Dunhuang and Chinese Buddhism], ed. Makita Tairyō and Fukui Fumimasa (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1984), 383–410.

<sup>14</sup> The main issue on which Wu disagrees with Ueyama is that of Chödrup’s ethnicity: while Ueyama believes that Chödrup was Chinese (Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 104), Wu argues he was Tibetan (Wu, “Daibankoku daitoku sanzō hōshi Hōjō denkō,” 387).

<sup>15</sup> Wang Yao 王堯, “Tufan yishi Guan Facheng shenshi shiji kao 吐蕃譯師管法成身世事蹟考 [Studies on the Life Activities of the Tibetan Translator ‘Gos Chödrup],” in *Xizang wenshi kaoxin ji* 西藏文史考信集 [Collection of Studies on Tibetan Literature and History] (Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, 1994), 17–33.



Chödrup's compositions, including translations from Chinese into Tibetan and vice versa, and various lecture notes and commentaries.<sup>16</sup>

Since most of the aforementioned publications, especially the pioneering works by Ueyama, Wu, and Wang, are not yet fully available in Western languages, much of the knowledge they contain has not received the attention it deserves. This consequently limits the status of their research as a foundation for further new studies on Buddhism in Dunhuang.<sup>17</sup> In view of this fact, I aim to introduce these works to potential readers in the English-speaking world. I intend to embed such an introduction into my own investigation of Chödrup's monastic career out of two considerations: on the one hand, to reduce duplication, as the above publications already considerably overlap with each other; and, on the other, to achieve a more systematic and panoramic view by comparing and reviewing the diverse discussions thematically.

The main discussion of my paper will be classified into three themes: (1) Chödrup's role as a translator who translated from Chinese into Tibetan and from Tibetan and Sanskrit into Chinese; (2) his activities as a Buddhist scholar who composed exegetical works and conducted lectures; and (3) a tentative chronology of his monastic activities. I will skip any discussion of his family background, as there is not enough information

---

<sup>16</sup> There are also other studies devoted to more specific questions, such as Chödrup's individual translations (e.g., Junjirō Takakusu, "A Comparative Study of the Tripiṭaka and the Tibetan *Dsañ-Lun*," in *Actes du douzieme congres international des orientalistes—Rome 1899* (Florence: Société Typographique Florentine, 1901), 11–32); Chödrup's commentary on Kamalaśīla's *Śālistambasūtraṭīka* (Yoshimura Shūki 芳村修基, "Kamarashira zō tōgankyōshaku hōjō yaku no suitei カマラシーラ造『稻芋経釈』法成訳の推定 [The Surmise that Chödrup Translated the *Śālistambakaṭīkā* Composed by Kamalaśīla]," *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 / *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 7.4 (1956): 128–129); Chödrup's role in the *sūtra*-copying project in Dunhuang (Zhang Yangqing 张延清, "Fanyijia jiaoyue dashi facheng jiqi jiaojing mulu 翻译家校阅大师法成及其校经目录 [The Great Translator and Proofreader Chödrup and a Catalogue of His Proofread Manuscripts]," *Dunhuang xue jikan* 敦煌学辑刊 / *Journal of the Dunhuang Studies* 3 (2008): 75–93); and his handwriting (Channa Li, "Toward A Typology of Chödrup's (Tib. Chos grub, Chin. Facheng 法成) Cursive Handwriting: A Palaeographical Perspective," *BuddhistRoad Paper* 1.2 (2021), just to name a few.

<sup>17</sup> This is not to say that their works are totally unknown or unused in English scholarship. Sam van Schaik, for instance, has already acknowledged Ueyama's contributions many times in his publications, such as in 2013, 2014, and 2015. Matthew Kapstein also refers to Ueyama's publication (1983, in English) in his article "The Tibetan *Yulanpen Jing*," in *Contributions to the Cultural History of Early Tibet*, ed. Matthew T. Kapstein and Brandon Dotson (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 211–237.



for a solid discussion on this topic, apart from the fact that he was named Gö Chödrup in Tibetan and Wu Facheng (吳法成) in Chinese.<sup>18</sup>

## 2. Chödrup as a Translator

Bearing the title overseer of the Buddhist teaching (Tib. *bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs pa*),<sup>19</sup> which is frequently mentioned in the colophons of his translations, Chödrup was a leading member of the Buddhist clergy in both the Tibetan Empire and local Kingdom of Dunhuang, the Guiyijun rule<sup>20</sup> (851–1036?, 歸義軍, Return-to-Allegiance Army). Although he may have not acted as the actual highest monastic officer, according to the eulogies delivered to him,<sup>21</sup> Chödrup was treated as the state preceptor (Chin.

<sup>18</sup> Chödrup's family background is briefly introduced in Li, "Toward A Typology of Chödrup's Cursive Handwriting," 10–11. I am also excited to learn that Meghan Howard has already defended her PhD dissertation on the topic of Chödrup. However, I have not yet accessed it as it is currently under embargo. I eagerly anticipate the potential formation of a working group dedicated to further exploring this significant figure in the future. Meghan Howard (Masang), "Translation at the Crossroads: The Career of Wu Facheng 吳法成 / Go Chödrup འགོ་ཚེས་གྲུབ་ Set in Context" (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2023). Also see Meghan Howard Masang, "Sino-Tibetan Scholasticism: Case Study of the Sino-Tibetan Scholasticism: A Case Study of the *Pratīyasamutpādhārdaya* in Dunhuang," in *Buddhism in Central Asia III—Impacts of Non-Buddhist Influences, Doctrines*, ed. Lewis Doney, Carmen Meinert, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Yukiyo Kasai (Leiden: Brill, 2023), 296–349.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. fn. 160 and 170 for discussions on the meaning of *khenpo* (Tib. *m Khan po*) and *ringluk* (Tib. *ring lugs*). However, it should be noted that he never served as the highest monastic officer in Tibet or in Dunhuang despite his great influence.

<sup>20</sup> For the history of the ups and downs of the Guiyijun rule over Dunhuang, see the recent studies: Henrik H. Sørensen, "Guiyijun and Buddhism at Dunhuang: A Year by Year Chronicle," *BuddhistRoad Paper* 4.2 (2019); Henrik H. Sørensen, "Buddhism in Dunhuang," in *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism. Volume Four. History: Part Two: Central and East Asia*, ed. Richard Bowring and Vincent Eltschinger (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2023), 27a–42b; and the older study Rong Xinjiang 榮新江, *Guiyijun shi yanjiu* 歸義軍史研究 [Studies of the History of Guiyijun] (Shanghai: Shanghai guiji chubanshe, 1996).

<sup>21</sup> Two versions of his eulogy are preserved in three Dunhuang manuscripts. P. 2913 (*Datang Dunhuang yijing sanzang wuheshang miaozenzan* 大唐燉煌譯經三藏吳和尚遼真讚 [The Eulogy of Monk Wu, Translator and Tripitakācārya at Dunhuang in the Great Tang Dynasty]) and P. 4640 (*Gu Wu heshang mianzanwen* 故吳和尚遼讚文 [Text in Praise of the Old Master Wu]) contain the same version. The other eulogy is named *Datang Shazhou yijing sanzang dade Wu heshang miaozenzan* 大唐沙州譯經三藏大德吳和尚貌真讚 [The Eulogy of Monk Wu, Translator and Tripitakācārya at Shazhou in the Great Tang Dynasty] and preserved in the undated P. 4660. Studies on these eulogies can be seen in Zheng Binglin 鄭炳林, *Dunhuang beiming zan jishi* 敦煌碑銘贊輯釋 [An Annotated Compilation of Eulogy Texts in Dunhuang] (Lanzhou: Gansu jiaoyu chubanshe, 1992), 85,

*guoshi* 國師) and royal preceptor (Chin. *wangshi* 王師) of the Tibetan king (Tib. *btsan po*) and was regarded as the preceptor by Zhang Yichao (799–872, 張義潮), the ruler of the independent Guiyijun at Dunhuang.<sup>22</sup> However, among his many titles, Chödrup was first and foremost known as a great Buddhist translator. He translated Buddhist texts from Tibetan to Chinese and vice versa,<sup>23</sup> and possibly translated texts directly from Sanskrit.

## 2.1 Chödrup's Tibetan Translations

Fifteen<sup>24</sup> of Chödrup's Tibetan translations are collected in the Kangyurs, but many more are found only in Dunhuang manuscripts. A total of twenty-three Tibetan translations by Chödrup are known.<sup>25</sup> I also list the location of each translation in the four early Tibetan catalogues: the imperial catalogue LKK, the imperial catalogue *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma* [Catalogue from the Court of 'Phang thang ma] (abbr. PTK), the early postimperial *Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od* [The Light of the Ornament of the Comprehensive Teaching] (abbr. TGGNO),<sup>26</sup> and Butön's BC.

---

188, 311. There is a eulogy of another Monk Wu, written by Dou Liangqi (fl. 9th c., 竇良器) and preserved in P. 4660, but this refers to Hongbian (d. 862, 洪辯), who also had the appellation of Junior Monk Wu (Chin. *xiao Wu heshang* 小吳和尚). Cf. Zheng Binglin, *Dunhuang beiming zan jishi*, 89, 200.

<sup>22</sup> P. 4660: 聖神贊普 [...] 願為國師 [...] 司空奉國, 固請我師 (“The sacred emperor requested him to be the state preceptor [...]. When the Minister came to power [literally, ‘to be devoted to the state’], he earnestly requested Chödrup to be his own preceptor”).

<sup>23</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 112–153; Wang Yao, “Tufan yishi guan facheng shenshi shiji kao.”

<sup>24</sup> These include (2.1.1) to (2.1.13) and (2.1.21), which only appears in the Tempangma (Tib. *Them spang ma*) lineage of Kangyurs. In addition, the (2.1.23) *'Phags pa lang kar gshegs pa 'i theg pa chen po 'i mdo* [Mahāyāna Sūtra Entitled the Laṅkāvatāra] (Derge 107) is also presumed to be Chödrup's work, possibly translated from Sanskrit. Cf. Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 113; Kawagoe Eishin 川越英真, *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma* [Catalogue of 'Phang thang ma] (Sendai: Tōhoku Indo-Chibetto Kenkyūkai, 2005), 9, n. 33. In any case, Derge 107 is a text with a complicated textual history that is worth further study.

<sup>25</sup> The translations are listed according to their sequence in the Derge Kangyur. When the translations do not appear in the Kangyurs, I follow the sequence of the numeration with the prefix IOL Tib, when available.

<sup>26</sup> Schaeffer, Kurtis and Leonard van der Kuijp, *An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od of Bcom ldan ral gri* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009).



2.1.1 *Go cha'i bkod pa bstan pa* [Teaching on the Armor's Array]  
(*Derge 51, LKK 31, PTK 685, TGGNO 5.7, BC 134*)

This text is the seventh chapter of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* [Noble Great Collection of Jewels] (Chin. *Da baoji jing* 大寶積經, Tib. *dKon mchog brtsegs pa chen po*; abbr. MRK). It was translated from *Pijia zhuangyan hui* 被甲莊嚴會 [The Chapter on the Armor's Array] (T. 310.7). Chödrup's translatorship is confirmed by the colophons of Kangyurs of the Tempangma lineage.<sup>27</sup> However, neither the two available imperial Tibetan catalogues, LKK and PTK, nor the early post-imperial catalogues TGGNO and BC list this translation in the section on scriptures translated from Chinese, nor do they mention its translator. It is thus worthwhile to consider what source of knowledge led the editors of the Tempangma Kangyur lineage to claim Chödrup as the translator.

The PTK lists this entry in its section on 'sūtras and vinayas whose translations are not complete' (Tib. *mdo sde dang 'dul ba'i bsgyur 'phro*).<sup>28</sup> It is thus plausible that the text was in the process of translation when the PTK was compiled. It may also be noted that in the LKK, the presumably earlier catalogue, the text already appears in the *Ratnakūṭa* section (LKK 31). It could have been added to the LKK when the catalogue was re-edited at a later time, which must have taken place after the whole MRK collection had been translated into Tibetan. Therefore, the translation of the text would have been finished after 842, if we accept Dotson's dating for the PTK.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> According to the colophons of the Stog, Tokyo, Ulan Bator, and Narthang Kangyurs, this text 'was translated by the translator Chödrup from the Chinese exemplar' (Tib. *lo tsa/tstsha ba mgos chos grub kyis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur ba'o*). The Narthang Kangyur follows the Tempangma lineage in the case of this text.

<sup>28</sup> See my previous discussion in Li, "A Survey of Tibetan Sūtras Translated from Chinese," 207.

<sup>29</sup> Brandon Dotson, "Emperor Mu rug btsan and the 'Phang thang ma Catalogue," *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 3 (2007): 4. Cf. also Georgios Halkias, "Tibetan Buddhism Registered: A Catalogue from the Imperial Court of 'Phang Thang," *The Eastern Buddhist* 36.1–2 (2004): 54–55; Yamaguchi Zuihō, "The Fiction of King Dar Ma's Persecution of Buddhism," in *De Dunhuang au Japon: Études Chinoises et Bouddhiques Offertes à Michel Soyminié*, ed. Jean Pierre Drège (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1996), 250.

2.1.2 *Tshe dang ldan pa dga' bo la mngal du 'jug pa bstan pa* [Teaching to Nanda on Entering the Womb] (*Derge 58, LKK 38, PTK 683, TNGO 5.13, BC 141*)

This was translated from the Chinese *Fowei A'nan shuo chu taizang hui* 佛為阿難說處胎會 [The Chapter on the Teaching to Ānanda on Entering the Womb] (T. 310.13), the thirteenth chapter of the MRK. The Tibetan translation of this title was confused with that of *Derge 57 (dGa' bo mngal na gnas pa bstan pa* [The Teaching to Nanda on the Abiding in the Womb]), leading not only to the verbs being switched in translation,<sup>30</sup> but also to the mixup of *Nanda* (Tib. *dGa' bo*) and *Ananda* (Tib. *Kun dga' bo*).

Just as we see in the case of *Derge 51*, Chödrup's translatorship of *Derge 58* is only recorded in the colophons of the Stog, Tokyo, Ulan Bator, and Narthang Kangyurs, all of which belong to the Tempangma Kangyur lineage.<sup>31</sup> The PTK lists this entry in its section on 'sūtras and vinayas whose translations are not complete' (Tib. *mdo sde dang 'dul ba'i bsgyur 'phro*). Therefore, the translation of this text may also have been finished after 842.

2.1.3 *Bu mo rnam dag dad bas zhus pa zhes bya ba* [Question of the Girl Vimalaśraddhā] (*Derge 84, LKK 64, PTK 185, TGGNO 5.40, BC 167*)

This was translated from the fortieth chapter of the MRK, the *Jingxin tongnü hui* 淨信童女會 [Chapter on the Girl Vimalaśraddhā] (T. 310.40). Chödrup's translatorship is likewise not indicated by the imperial catalogues, but only in Kangyur colophons such as those of the Stog, Tokyo, Ulan Bator, Narthang, and Urga Kangyurs.

---

<sup>30</sup> This point has been noted by Robert Kritzer ("Tibetan Texts of *Garbhāvākraṅtisūtra*: Differences and Borrowings," *The Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 15 (2012): 133), and later also in Jonathan A. Silk, "Chinese Sūtras in Tibetan Translation: A Preliminary Survey," *The Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 22 (2019): 232. The Chinese verb 'to stay in the womb' (Chin. *chutai* 處胎, in T. 310.13) was translated into Tibetan as 'to enter the womb' (Tib. *mngal du 'jug pa*, in *Derge 58*), while the Chinese verb 'to enter the womb' (Chin. *rutai* 入胎, in T. 310.14) was translated into Tibetan as *mngal na gnas pa*, literally meaning 'to stay in the womb' (in *Derge 57*).

<sup>31</sup> For instance, the Stog Kangyur colophon states: *lo tsa ba 'go chos grub kyis rgya nag gi dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa* ("it was translated from the Chinese exemplar, corrected, and finalised by the translator Gö Chödrup"). Stog 11.13, *dkon brtsegs, ga, 388a1–2*.



What makes this text different from the above two cases is that Derge 84 is listed in the PTK's section on '[sūtras of the] length of a half *bam po*' (Tib. [*mdo sde phra mo*] *bam po phyed pa la*),<sup>32</sup> which suggests that it had already been translated before the compilation of the PTK.

2.1.4 *Lang kar gshegs pa rin po che'i mdo las sangs rgyas thams cad kyi gsung gi snying po'i le'u* [Chapter on the Quintessence of the Speech of All Buddhas, from the Sūtra of the Precious *Laṅkāvatāra*] (*Derge 108, LKK 252, TGGNO 11.3, BC 191*)

This was translated from *Lengqie abaduoluo bao jing* 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經 [Sūtra of the Precious *Laṅkāvatāra*] (T. 670.14). The PTK does not record this entry. According to the Kangyur colophons, “by order of the glorious, heavenly king, Chödrup translated and corrected this text, combining it with Wenhwi's commentary [on the *Laṅkāvatāra*].”<sup>33</sup> In other words, Chödrup relied on Wenhwi's (fl. 7–8th? c.)<sup>34</sup> commentary in translating the root text. Ueyama suggests that Chödrup first translated the complete text of Wenhwi's commentary, then extracted the root texts from the commentary to form a separate translation.<sup>35</sup> Chödrup's translatorship of Wenhwi's commentary is indeed attested in the colophon of IOL Tib J 219.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Kawagoe, *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma*, 14.

<sup>33</sup> Derge 108, *mdo sde, ca.*, 284b7: *dpal lha btsan po'i bka' lung gis rgya'i slob bdon wen hwi yis mdzad pa'i 'grel pa dang sbyar nas/ lo tstsha ba dge slong 'gos chos grub kyis bsgyur cing zhus.*

<sup>34</sup> Wenhwi's life activities were not documented in transmitted texts. Kawaguchi Eka noticed that the colophon appended to the title of the fourth fascicle of the *Lengqie jing shu* 楞伽經疏 (S. 5603) attributes the authorship of the text to Yuanhui (圓暉) from Zhong dayun Temple (中大雲寺). Consequently, Kawaguchi identified Wenhwi as Yuanhui (圓暉). See Kawaguchi Eka 河口慧海, “Yabuki hakushi satsuei shōrai no nyū ryōga kyō kenkyū 矢吹博士撮影將來の楞伽經研究 [A Study of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* Photographed and Brought in by Dr. K. Yabuki],” in *Meisha yoin kaisetsu: Tonkō shutsudo miden koitsu butten kaihō* 鳴沙餘韻解說: 燉煌出土未傳古逸佛典開寶 [Rare and Unknown Chinese Manuscripts Remains of Buddhist Literature Discovered in Tunhuang Collected by Sir Aurel Stein and Preserved in the British Museum], ed. Yabuki Keiki 矢吹慶輝 (Tokyo: Iwanami, 1933), 438. This Yuanhui authors another work *Jushe lun song shu* 俱舍論頌疏 [Commentary on the Verses of the *Abhidharmakośa*].

<sup>35</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 115.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, fig. 10; 113–117.

2.1.5 *mDzangs* (or 'Dzangs) *blun gyi mdo* [Sūtra of the Wise and Foolish] (Derge 341, LKK 250, PTK 230, TGGNO 7.6, BC 75)<sup>37</sup>

Translated from the *Xianyu jing* 賢愚經 [Sūtra of the Wise and Foolish]. The Derge Kangyur version states that this text was translated from Chinese.<sup>38</sup> The *sDe dge'i bka' 'gyur dkar chag* [Derge Kangyur Catalogue] and Butön's catalogue state that Chödrup translated this text from Sanskrit and Chinese.<sup>39</sup> To my knowledge, however, there is yet no decisive evidence to prove that part of the translation was also rendered from Sanskrit. Ueyama argues that the Chinese version available to Chödrup may have been quite different from the Taishō version.<sup>40</sup> In Dunhuang, several manuscripts of the *Sūtra of the Wise and Foolish* are found: P. T. 943 contains the text of chapters 38 to 49 (chapter sequence follows the Derge Kangyur version); P. T. 945 contains the *U pa gup ta'i le'u* [Chapter on Upagupta] (chapter 47) and *dGe tshul kyun te'i le'u* [Chapter on Śramanera Kunti] (chapter 51);<sup>41</sup> IOL Tib J 217 is a summary of the *Ka phyi na'i le'u* [Chapter on Ka phyi na] (chapter 24); and P. T. 2105 contains the beginning of the *Rab tu byung ba'i yon tan bsngags pa'i le'u* [Chapter on the Praise of Merits of Going Forth] (chapter 15).<sup>42</sup> Among them, IOL Tib J 217 may have been written by Chödrup himself.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Through a philological survey of its content, Junjirō Takakusu has already confirmed that the Tibetan version is a translation from Chinese. See Junjirō Takakusu, "A Comparative Study of the Tripiṭaka and the Tibetan *Dsañ-Lun*," 11–32. Cf. Channa Li, *Challenging the Buddha's Authority: A Narrative Perspective of the Power Dynamics between the Buddha and His Disciples* (PhD diss., Leiden University, 2019), 51–57, for a discussion of the textual history of the *Xianyu jing* 賢愚經 [Sūtra of the Wise and Foolish] and its Tibetan translation. Cf. Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 124–126.

<sup>38</sup> Derge 341, *mdo sde, a*, 298a7: *rgya nag las 'gyur bar snang ngo*.

<sup>39</sup> BC 75; Derge Kangyur, *lakṣmī*, 135b7: *'gos chos grub kyis rgya gar dang rgya* [Derge catalogue: *rgya nag*] *i dpe las bsgyur ba*.

<sup>40</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 125.

<sup>41</sup> This discovery is independently made by Shayne Clarke and Xiaoqiang Meng. See Xiaoqiang Meng, "A Preliminary Study of the Dunhuang Tibetan Fragments of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Ekottarakarmaśataka* (I): *Tarjanīyakarman*." *Acta Asiatica Varsoviensia* 34.2 (2021): 206.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 125–126; Saerji, "Revisiting the Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish," in *Illuminating the Dharma: Buddhist Studies in Honour of Venerable Professor KL Dhammajoti*, ed. Toshiichi Endo (Hongkong: The University of Hong Kong, 2021), 327.

<sup>43</sup> Li, "Toward A Typology of Chödrup's Cursive Handwriting," 19–21.



2.1.6 *Legs nyes kyi rgyu dang 'bras bu bstan pa* [Teaching on the Cause and Effect of the Wholesome and Unwholesome] (*Derge 354*)<sup>44</sup>

Translated from *Shan'e yinguo jing* 善惡因果經 [Sūtra of the Cause and Effect of the Wholesome and Unwholesome] (T. 2881.85). The Kangyur colophons state that “the chief editor, translator, [and] monk Chödrup translated [this] from Sanskrit and Chinese exemplars and corrected and finalised it.”<sup>45</sup> In the Dunhuang corpus, this translation is found in IOL Tib J 220,<sup>46</sup> IOL Tib J 221, IOL Tib J 298, and IOL Tib J 335.2–3.<sup>47</sup> The LKK and PTK do not record this translation. It is possible that the translation was finished after the compilation of the two imperial catalogues.

It may be noted that *Derge 355*, another Tibetan translation from the same Chinese text, is similar to *Derge 354*. I suspect that both of them were translated by Chödrup. The intertextual relationship between *Derge 354* and *355* must be examined further. Moreover, Ren has discovered that the terminology used in IOL Tib J 687 (“a short treatise on the *bslab pa'i gzhi brgyad* [eight fundamental precepts], composed by Chödrup”) overlaps considerably with that of *Derge 354*.<sup>48</sup>

2.1.7 *gSer 'od dam pa mchog tu rnam par rgyal pa mdo sde rgyal po* [King of Sūtras, the Supremely Victorious, Excellent Golden Light]

(*Derge 555, LKK 251, PTK 231, TGGNO 11.4, BC 210*)<sup>49</sup>

This was translated from the Chinese *Jin guangming zuisheng wang jing* 金光明最勝王經 [King of Sūtras, the Supremely Victorious, Excellent Golden Light] (T. 665.16).<sup>50</sup> The Kangyur colophons confirm Chödrup's

<sup>44</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 119–121, Ren Xiaobo 任曉波, *Zangyi Shan'e yinguo jing duikan yu yanjiu* 藏譯《善惡因果經》對勘與研究 [Studies on the Tibetan Translation of the *Shan'e yinguo jing*] (Beijing: Renmin daxue, 2012).

<sup>45</sup> *Derge 354, mdo sde, ah*, 208b7: *zhu chen gyi lo tstsha ba ban de chos grub kyis rgya gar dang rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing te gtan la phab pa*.

<sup>46</sup> According to IOL Tib J 220, the title is *'phags pa las legs nges kyi rgyu dang 'bras bu bstan pa zhes bya ba'i mdo*.

<sup>47</sup> Ren, *Zangyi Shan'e yinguo jing duikan yu yanjiu*, 13.

<sup>48</sup> Ren, *Zangyi Shan'e yinguo jing duikan yu yanjiu*, 8.

<sup>49</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 121–124; Li, “A Survey of Tibetan Sūtras Translated from Chinese,” 196–197.

<sup>50</sup> It may be noted that in the Kangyur versions, the title of the Chinese text was transliterated as *tA shin kyin kwang mya'u tsa'i shin wang kyin* (corresponding to *dasheng jin guangming zuishengwang jing* 大乘金光明最勝王經).



translatorship and his high status in the clergy, namely ‘overseer of the Buddhist teaching’ (Tib. *bcom ldan ’das kyi ring lugs pa*.)<sup>51</sup>

2.1.8 *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* [Dhāraṇī Entitled the Complete Perfection of the Broad Mind of the Unimpeded Great Compassion of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara with a Thousand Hands and a Thousand Eyes; *abbr.* Great Compassion Dhāraṇī] (Derge 691/[repeat verbatim in D897], LKK Ø, PTK 732, BC 1140)

Translated from *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 [The Vast, Perfect, and Unobstructed Dhāraṇīsūtra of the Great Compassionate Heart [Taught by] the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara with 1000 Eyes and 1000 Arms] (T. 1060.20). The Kangyur colophons acknowledge Chödrup as the translator.<sup>52</sup>

Derge 691, which contains three volumes (Tib. *bam po*), could not be identified in the LKK. However, Herrmann-Pfandt argues that the entry LKK 338, entitled ‘*Phags pa snying rje chen po’i rang bzhin gyi gzungs* [Nobel Dhāraṇī of the Essence of the Great Compassion] (LKK 338, PTK 322), may have been the first volume of Derge 691.<sup>53</sup> According to her hypothesis, the translation of Derge 691 underwent several stages: firstly, its *dhāraṇī* section was completed and recorded in the LKK; later, the remaining volumes were finished. Given this, the *Great Compassion Dhāraṇī*, would have been completed between the LKK and PTK’s completion dates (i.e., between 812 and 842).

2.1.9 *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* [Dhāraṇī

<sup>51</sup> Derge 555, *rgyud, pa*, 151a7: *zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang lo tsa ba bcom ldan ’das kyi ring lugs pa bande chos grub kyis rgya’l pde las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa rgya yi skad du* (“It was translated from the Chinese exemplar, corrected, and finalised by the chief editor, teacher, translator, overseer of the Buddhist teaching, [and] monk Chödrup”).

<sup>52</sup> Derge 691, *rgyud, tsa*, 129b6: *zhu chen gyi lotstsha ba bande chos grub kyis rgya’i dpe las bsgyur te gtan la phab ba*.

<sup>53</sup> Herrmann-Pfandt, *Die Lhan kar ma*, 187–188. Another possibility is that LKK 338/PTK 322 was identified with Pukdrak 510, a different one-volume translation of the *Mahākāraṇīkadhāraṇī*.



Entitled the Avalokiteśvara’s Secret Treasure, the Quintessence of the Unimpeded Wish-fulfilling Wheel; abbr. Avalokiteśvara’s Unimpeded Wish-fulfilling Wheel] (*Derge 692* [repeat verbatim in *Derge 898*], *LKK 343*, *PTK Ø*, *TGGNO 11.17*, *BC 1141*)

Translated from *Guanshiyin pusa mimizang ruyilun tuoluoni shenzhou jing* 觀世音菩薩祕密藏如意輪陀羅尼神咒經 [Dhāraṇī Sūtra Entitled the Avalokiteśvara’s Secret Treasure of the Unimpeded Wish-fulfilling Wheel] (T. 1082.20). The BC confirms that Chödrup was the translator. The Kangyur colophons recognise Chödrup’s high status as the overseer of the Buddhist teaching.<sup>54</sup> It should be noted that the PTK does not record this translation.

2.1.10 *Zhal bcu gcig pa’i rig sngags kyi snying po zhes bya ba’i gzungs* [Dhāraṇī Entitled the Quintessence of the Spell of the Eleven-faced Avalokiteśvara] (*Derge 694*, *LKK 366*, *PTK 349*, *BC 1143*)

Translated from *Shiyimian shenzhou xinjing* 十一面神咒心經 [Sūtra Entitled the Quintessence of the Dhāraṇī of the Eleven-faced Avalokiteśvara] (T. 1071.20). The Kangyur colophons recognise Chödrup’s status as the overseer of the Buddhist teaching.<sup>55</sup> Among the famous *dhāraṇīs* related to Avalokiteśvara, this text would have been translated earliest.

2.1.11 *dGongs pa zab mo nyes par ’grel pa’i mdo’i rgya cher ’grel pa* [Extensive Commentary on the Sūtra of Elucidating the Profound Intention] (*Derge 4016*, *LKK565*, *PTK 773*, *TGGNO 11.19*; *BC 655 = 676*)<sup>56</sup>

Translated from the *Jie shenmi jing shu* 解深密經疏 [Commentary on the Sūtra of Elucidating the Profound Intention], a Chinese commentary composed by Wonch’uk. According to the colophons, “by order of the glorious heavenly king, the chief editor, translator, [and] monk Gö

<sup>54</sup> *Derge 692*, *rgyud, tsa*, 137a7: *zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang lo tstsha ba bcom ldan ’das kyi ring lugs pa bande chos grub kyi rgya’i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa.*

<sup>55</sup> *Derge 694*, *rgyud, tsa*, 147b3: *zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang lo tstsha ba/ bcom ldan ’das kyi ring lugs pa bande chos grub kyi rgya’i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa.*

<sup>56</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukyō no kenkyū*, 117–119; Steinkellner, “Who Is Byang chub rdzu ’phrul?”

Chödrup translated this from the Chinese exemplar, corrected it, and finalised it.”<sup>57</sup>

2.1.12–13 *Khar sil gyi mdo and Khar sil 'chang pa'i kun tu spyod pa'i cho ga* [Sūtra of the Ringing Staff; Rites for the Practices of Holding the Ringing Staff] (Derge 335–336, IOL Tib J 205, LKK Ø, PTK 725, TGGNO 11.37–38, BC 31–32)<sup>58</sup>

Although the Kangyurs contain no record of its translator, IOL Tib J 205 preserves a colophon that claims the two texts were “translated from the Chinese exemplars, corrected, and finalised by the chief editor, translator, [and] monk Chödrup” (Tib. *zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba ban de chos grub kyis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te/ gtan la phab pa*). According to Ueyama, the Chinese version in Chödrup's hand is different from the Taishō edition: the Dunhuang version, as attested in S. 4294, skips a section in the middle (i.e., *Dedao tideng xizhang jing* 得道梯橙錫杖經 [Sūtra on the Step Ladder and Ringing Staff of Attaining the Path], T. 785.17, 735a14–c5).<sup>59</sup>

2.1.14 *Dus dang dus ma yin pa bstan pa zhes bya ba'i mdo* [Sūtra Entitled the Teaching on the Proper and Improper Time] (IOL Tib J 213)<sup>60</sup>

Translated from the *Shi feishi jing* 時非時經 [Sūtra on the Proper and Improper Time] (T. 794.17).

According to Ueyama, the Tibetan version is closer to the eighth-century *Chion-in* (知恩院) edition from Japan, compared to other versions in the Chinese *tripiṭaka*.<sup>61</sup> This Tibetan translation is not collected in the Kangyurs, nor mentioned in the two imperial catalogues. IOL Tib J 213 has the colophon: “Chief editor, teacher, translator, overseer of the Buddhist teaching, monk Chödrup translated it from the Chinese exemplar, corrected and finalised it” (Tib. *zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang/*

<sup>57</sup> Derge 4015, *mdo 'grel (mdo), di*, 175: *rgya'i slob dpon wen tshig gis mdzad pa rdzogs soll dpal lha btsan po'i bka' lung gis/ zhu chen gyi lo tsā ba dge slong 'gos chos grub kyis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa*.

<sup>58</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 141–143.

<sup>59</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 142.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 129–140.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 130.



*lo tsa ba bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs ban de chos grub gyis rgya 'I dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te/ gtan la phab pa).*

2.1.15 *Lang kar gshegs pa rin po che 'i mdo las sangs rgyas thams cad kyi gsung gi snying po 'i le 'u rgya cher 'grel pa* [Extensive Commentary on the Chapter on the Quintessence of the Speech of All Buddhas, from the Sūtra of the Greatly Precious Lañkāvatāra, *abbr.* Extensive Commentary on the Lañkāvatāra] (*IOL Tib J 219*<sup>62</sup>, *LKK 568?*, *PTK 517*<sup>63</sup>)

This was translated from Wenhwi's commentary on the *Lañkāvatāra*.<sup>64</sup> In Dunhuang manuscripts S. 5603 and P. T. 609, the Tibetan translations are inserted between the sentences of Wenhwi's commentary. These two manuscripts may reflect an intermediate stage in the process of translating Wenhwi's commentary into Tibetan.

2.1.16–17 *Yi ge brgya pa zhes bya ba 'i rab tu byed pa tshig le 'ur byas pa* [Verse on the Treatise Entitled 'the Hundred Syllables'] and *Yi ge brgya pa 'i rab tu byed pa rnam par bshad pa* [Exposition on the Treatise Entitled 'The Hundred Syllables'] (*IOL Tib J 588 I, II*)

Translated from the *Baizi lun* 百字論 [Treatise Entitled the Hundred Syllables] (T. 1572.30) (presumably authored by Śāntideva, fl. mid-8th c.). The two texts were written in the same manuscript (*IOL Tib J 588*) together with 2.1.18 and 2.1.19.<sup>65</sup> These four texts are only known from Dunhuang, and are not recorded in historically transmitted sources such

<sup>62</sup> PTK 517 indicates that this long commentary was translated from Chinese. Cf. Kawagoe, *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma*, 26.

<sup>63</sup> PTK 517: *Lang kar gshegs pa 'i ti ka rgya 'gyur*, 40 vols. As demonstrated by Ueyama (*Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 115), Chödrup probably first translated Wenhui's Chinese commentary on the *Lañkāvatāra*, then extracted the root text from the commentary to compose the translation of the *sūtra*. However, there is one difficulty in identifying PTK 517 with Chödrup's translation of Wenhui's commentary, namely that PTK 517 was surprisingly long, at 40 vols.

<sup>64</sup> According to Ueyama (*Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 390–392), this Chinese commentary (partially preserved in P. 2198) contains four fascicles and was composed by Wenhui around the year 742.

<sup>65</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 148–150.

as Kangyur, TGGNO, or BC. The colophons of this Dunhuang manuscript confirm that Chödrup was the translator of these four texts.<sup>66</sup>

2.1.18–19 *rTen cing 'brel par 'byung ba tshig le'ur byas pa sum cu pa* [Thirty Verses on Dependent Arising] and *rTen cing 'brel par 'byung ba tshig le'ur byas pa sum cu pa'i rnam par bshad pa* [Explanation to the Thirty Verses on Dependent Arising] (*IOL Tib J 588 III, IV; IOL Tib J 619; P. T. 770*)<sup>67</sup>

Translated from *Yuansheng lun* 緣生論 [Treatise on Dependent Arising] (T. 1652.32).

2.1.20 *'Jug pa'i sgra brgyad bstan pa tshig le'ur byas pa* [Exposé in Verse Form (on) the Set of Eight Nominal Cases (as They) Occur (in Use)] (*IOL Tib J 625r; P. T. 783*)<sup>68</sup>

The colophon informs us that Chödrup translated this text from Chinese.<sup>69</sup> It is a metrical treatise on the eightfold system of Sanskrit nominal declension. The first eight sentences are example sentences, while the next eight provide definitions of the eight nominal cases. Beneath the definition of each nominal case, an interlinear sentence is inserted to explain which part of the example sentence features the case in question (these interlinear

<sup>66</sup> E. g., *IOL Tib J 588, 1v1: zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba ban de chos grub kyiis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te/ gtan la phab pa.*

<sup>67</sup> *The rTen cing 'brel par 'byung ba tshig le'ur byas pa sum cu pa'i rnam par bshad pa* (Skt. \**Praṭītyasamutpādakārikātrīṃśikavyākhyāna*) is a Tibetan translation from the Chinese translation *Yuansheng lun* 緣生論 [Commentary on Dependent Arising] (T. 1652.32, Skt. \**Praṭītyasamutpādakārikā*) made by Dharmagupta (d. 619, Chin. Damo Jiduo 達磨笈多).

<sup>68</sup> I adopt Verhagen's translation of the title. See Pieter Verhagen, "A Ninth-Century Tibetan Summary of the Indo-Tibetan Model of Case-Semantics," in *Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, ed. Shōren Ihara and Zuihō Yamaguchi (Narita: Naritashinshoji, 1992), 833–844. Cf. also Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 152–154. It is open to dispute whether this Tibetan text was translated from Chinese or from Sanskrit. While Ueyama ("Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi shamonhōjō no kenkyū [Ge]," 217, n. 51; *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 182) suggests that the colophon may have mistaken 'Sanskrit text' (Tib. *rgya gar gyi dpe*) for 'Chinese text' (Tib. *rgya'i dpe*), Verhagen ("A Ninth-Century Tibetan Summary of the Indo-Tibetan Model of Case-Semantics," 834) tends to believe that Chödrup himself was the composer.

<sup>69</sup> *IOL Tib J 625v3: zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang/ lo tsa pa ban de chos grub kyiis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te/ gtan la phab pa.* As I will discuss later, the Tibetan source (Tib. *rgya'i dpe*) here may not refer to its Chinese version (*Bazhuan shengsong* 八轉聲頌), but to the eightfold declension tradition that was prevalent in many Chinese texts known to Chödrup.



sentences were possibly written by Chödrup himself<sup>70</sup>). The Chinese version, *Bazhuan shengsong* 八轉聲頌 [Verses on the Application of the Eight Nominal Cases], is found in P. 3950, also translated by Chödrup (plausibly from Tibetan to Chinese, as I will argue in section 3.4).

2.1.21 *Yongs su skyobs pa'i snod ces bya ba'i mdo* [Sūtra Entitled the Vessel of Complete Protection] (*Stog* 266; *Ulan Bator* 314, *Tokyo* 266)  
This text is only collected in the Thempangma lineage of the Kangyurs, and the colophons recognise Chödrup as the translator.<sup>71</sup> The Tibetan was translated from the *Yulan pen jing* 盂蘭盆經 [Sūtra of the Yulan pen]. However, Kapstein has noted that the Chinese version upon which Chödrup based his translation differs from its Taishō edition.<sup>72</sup>

2.1.22 *Dga' bo mngal na gnas pa bstan pa* [The Teaching to Nanda on the Abiding in the Womb] (*Derge* 57, *LKK* 37, *PTK* 684)  
Ueyama suspects that this text was translated by Chödrup, a hypothesis that must be further examined.<sup>73</sup>

2.1.23 *'Phags pa lang kar gshegs pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo* [Mahāyāna Sūtra Entitled Lankāvatāra] (*Derge* 107, *LKK* 84, *PTK* 49, *BC* 190)  
It is still uncertain whether this text is a translation from Chinese. The Kangyur colophons claim it to be a translation rendered by Chödrup from Chinese.<sup>74</sup> However, if we accept this statement as true, it would imply that Chödrup translated the same text twice from Chinese (the other being 2.1.4, *Derge* 108), which seems both unusual and unnecessary. Kawaguchi Eka attempted to account for this by attributing it to Chödrup's excellence in translation, suggesting that Tibetans retained Chödrup's Chinese rendition (*Derge* 107) even when they had access to the Sanskrit version.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>70</sup> Li, "Toward A Typology of Chödrup's Cursive Handwriting," 14–15.

<sup>71</sup> *Stog* 266, *mdo sde, sa*, 260b3: *Zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba dge slong 'gos chos grub kyis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa'o*.

<sup>72</sup> Kapstein, "The Tibetan Yulanpen Jing," 211–237.

<sup>73</sup> Jonathan A. Silk, "Chinese Sūtras in Tibetan Translation," 233

<sup>74</sup> Colophons of the *Derge*, *Stog*, *Narthang*, *Lhasa*, *Shey*, *Urga*, and *Lithang* Kangyurs, with variation: *'phags pa lang kar gshegs pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo ji snyed pa rdzogs so/ bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs pa 'gos chos grub kyis rgya'i dpe las bsgyur te gtan la phab pa'o*.

<sup>75</sup> Kawaguchi Eka, "Yabuki hakushi satsuei shōrai no nyū ryōga kyō kenkyū," 436.

However, Sakuraba Bunkyō takes a different view, suggesting that the colophon of Derge 107 may have been erroneous. Based on the textual similarity between this Tibetan version and the Sanskrit, Derge 107 is presumed to be a translation from Sanskrit.<sup>76</sup> A preliminary textual comparison reveals that Derge 107 displays a closer textual affinity to the Sanskrit version, instead of to the Chinese T. 672.16.<sup>77</sup>

## 2.2 Chödrup's Chinese Translation

Chödrup also translated Buddhist texts into Chinese.<sup>78</sup> There are so far six Buddhist texts known to have been translated by Chödrup, some of which are translations from Tibetan, others from Sanskrit. None of these Chinese translations were included in the historical Chinese *tripitaka*, perhaps due to the fact that Dunhuang was an independent kingdom during Chödrup's later lifetime and, in fact, not any longer part of a central Chinese dynasty since the Tibetan rule over Dunhuang in the second half of the 8th century. The Taishō edition of the *tripitaka* has included them and assigned a number to each of them. Here is a brief review of the current scholarship on each translation and my own preliminary studies of them.

---

<sup>76</sup> Sakuraba Bunkyō 桜部文鏡, “Shuko makatai kyō to Ryōga kyō to nochi bettobon ni tsuite 衆許摩訶帝經と楞伽經との西藏本に就て [About the Tibetan Versions of the *Zhongxumohedi Sūtra* and *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*],” *Ōtani gakuhō* 大谷学報 / *The Journal of Buddhist Studies and Humanities* 15.2 (1934): 60–67.

<sup>77</sup> See Li, “A Survey of Tibetan Sūtras Translated from Chinese as Recorded in Tibetan Imperial Catalogues,” 198.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkū no kenkyū*, 170–186; Ueyama, “Daibankoku daitoku sanzō hōshi shamon Hōjō no kenkyū (Ge),” 119–135. He assumes that the source language for works including 諸星母陀羅尼經, 薩婆多宗五事論, and 菩薩律儀二十頌 (discussed below in this section) is Tibetan, which should be verified by more concrete studies.

Another Chinese *sūtra*, *Dasheng wuliangshou zongyao jing* 大乘無量壽宗要經 [The Mahāyāna *Aparimitāyursūtra*] (Skt. *Aparimitāyursūtra*), which is now numbered as T. 936.19, is attributed to Chödrup in the Japanese catalogue *Shōwa hōbō sōmoku roku* 昭和法寶總目錄 [Comprehensive Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure Compiled in the Showa Era]. Ueyama (*Tonkō bukkū no kenkyū*, 437–439), however, suspects that it had been translated before Chödrup's time. For further studies on this *sūtra*, see Mimaki Katsumi 御牧克己, “Daijō Muryōju shūyō-kyō 大乘無量壽宗要經 [The Mahāyāna *Aparimitāyursūtra*],” in *Kōza Tonkō 7: Tonkō to Chūgoku bukkū* 講座敦煌 7: 敦煌と中国仏教 [Lectures on Dunhuang 7: Dunhuang and Chinese Buddhism], ed. Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮 and Fukui Fumimasa 福井文雅 (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1984), 167–172.



2.2.1 *Banre boluomiduo xinjing* 般若波羅蜜多心經 [The Heart of the Perfection of Wisdom] (e.g., P. 4882), sometimes entitled *Juzu dou xin jing* 具足多心經 [Fully Developed Heart Sūtra]<sup>79</sup>

Chödrup’s translatorship is confirmed by the title colophon: “It was translated by the great, venerable *tripītakācārya* [and] monk Chödrup of the great Tibetan Empire” (Chin. *dafanguo dade sanzang fashi shamen facheng yi* 大番国大德三藏法師沙門法成譯). Ueyama claims that this version may have been translated from the Tibetan version of the longer version of the *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya* [Heart Sūtra].<sup>80</sup> However, he does not elaborate on the concrete evidence. My preliminary comparison between Chödrup’s Chinese version and the Sanskrit and different Tibetan

<sup>79</sup> E.g., Dx 919. Cf. Ueyama, “Daibankoku daitoku sanzō hōshi shamon Hōjō no kenkyū (Ge),” 122. The title *Juzu duoxin jing* contains two elements: *juzu* (具足, literally meaning ‘fully developed [version]’) and *duoxin jing* (多心經, another name for the *Heart Sūtra* in the Tang Dynasty (618–907, 唐)). Therefore, this title literally means ‘the fully developed version of the *Heart Sūtra*,’ namely, ‘the longer version of the *Heart Sūtra*.’ See Fukui Fumimasa 福井文雅, “Hannya shingyō to Tashingyō 般若心經と多心經 [The *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya* and the *Duoxin jing*],” *Shūkyō kenkyū* 宗教研究 [Religious Studies] 206 (1971): 152–153; Jonathan A. Silk, “The *Heart Sūtra* as *Dhāraṇī*,” *Acta Asiatica Bulletin of The Institute of Eastern Culture* 121 (2021): 103.

<sup>80</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 172. The history of the Sanskrit versions of the *Heart Sūtra* is still open to debate. There are basically two versions of the *Heart Sūtra*: the shorter version (without the frame section in which the Buddha preached to the monastic community in Rājagṛha and the audience was delighted upon hearing the teaching) and the longer one. Nattier’s landmark 1992 paper argues that the Sanskrit version of the shorter *Heart Sūtra* was a back-translation, possibly by Xuanzang, from the Chinese version of the *Banre boluomiduo xinjing* 般若波羅蜜多心經 [The Heart of the Perfection of Wisdom] (T. 251.8). According to Nattier (ibid. 158–169), this Chinese version (T. 251.8) is not a translation, but consists of a core passage excerpted from Kumārajīva’s *Mohe banre boluomi jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜經 [\**Mahāprajñāpāramitā*] (T. 223.8) and the frame elements (such as the appearance of Avalokiteśvara and the mantra) manufactured in China (Nattier, “The *Heart Sūtra*,” 174–176). As hinted in Nattier’s discussion of Indian criteria for authenticity, the longer version of the *Heart Sūtra* was possibly expanded from the shorter ‘back-translated’ Sanskrit version to equip the text with the proper format for a *sūtra* (“thus have I heard [...]”), the process of which possibly took place in India. The overwhelming majority of Indian and Tibetan commentaries of the *Heart Sūtra* are based on the longer version. James Apple in his recent publication points out that Kamalaśīla commented on the shorter *Heart Sūtra* rather than the longer one. See James Apple, “A Late Old Tibetan Version of the *Heart Sūtra* Preserved in Dunhuang IOL Tib J 751,” *The Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 27 (2023): 117–133.



versions supports Ueyama's hypothesis.<sup>81</sup> One piece of supporting evidence lies in Chödrup's translation of the term *míngliào* (明了, literally meaning 'illumination'), which was more likely translated directly from the Tibetan term *snang ba* ('illumination,' 'appearance') than from Sanskrit *avabhāsa* ('appearance'). Among the different Tibetan translations of the longer *Heart Sūtra*,<sup>82</sup> the versions contained in the so-called 'Vulgate Kangyur' (Recension A) and IOL Tib J 751 are closer to Chödrup's version, although there are still many notable differences. Hence, we must await a more thorough philological investigation to illuminate the textual relationship among the different versions of the *Heart Sūtra* in Chinese, Tibetan, and Sanskrit.

---

<sup>81</sup> For the Sanskrit text, I use the critical edition in Edward Conze, "The *Prāññāpāramitā-hṛdya Sūtra*," in *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies: Selected Essays by Edward Conze* (Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1967), 149–150. For the Tibetan text, I use Jonathan A. Silk's critical edition based on Derge 21 (translated by Vimalamitra and Rinchen dé (Tib. Rin chen sde)) as well as its Dunhuang testimonies, including P. T. 22 and P. T. 457. Cf. Jonathan A. Silk, *The Heart Sūtra in Tibetan: A Critical Edition of the Two Recensions Contained in the Kanjur* (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 1994), 106–150.

<sup>82</sup> Silk, *The Heart Sūtra in Tibetan*, identifies two canonical versions, labelled as 'Recension A' and 'Recension B,' respectively; Apple, "A Late Old Tibetan Version of the *Heart Sūtra*" identifies five types of the Tibetan *Heart Sūtra* in Dunhuang: (1) the long version agreeable to the Kangyur Long version (e.g., P. T. 457); (2) the long version different from the Kangyur Long version (P. T. 449); (3) a Tibetan transliteration of the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* (e.g., P. T. 448); (4) short versions (P. T. 451–456, P. T. 464–486); (5) the *Heart Sūtra* found in commentaries or liturgical texts including IOL Tib J 122 and IOL Tib J 751.

The scribe of the manuscript P. T. 449 wrote a short sentence indicating that this text was 'translated from a Chinese exemplar' (Tib. *rgya' gyī dpe las bsgyur ste*), with an added beginning and end (Tib. *'go mjug bsnan pa*). This implies that this text was *de facto* translated from one version of the short *Heart Sūtra*, and that the scribe well realised that its formulaic beginning and ending were added after the translation of the main body of the text. While it is without doubt that P. T. 449 must have been translated from Chinese (based on its peculiar translation terms), this version exhibits various degrees of textual disagreements with known Chinese versions of the *Heart Sūtra*. Among these, it is closest to Zhihuilun's (fl. 847–882, 智慧輪) Chinese version (T. 254.8).



2.2.2 *Zhu xingmu tuoluoni jing* 諸星母陀羅尼經 [Sūtra of the Mother Dhāraṇī Among the Stars] (Skt. *Grahamātrkādhāraṇī*; e.g., S. 5010, P. 3548, P. 4587, BD1164, BD1235, BD1842, BD1957, BD2315, BD2705, BD2750, BD2755, etc.)

Chödrup appears as the translator after the main title: “Monk Chödrup translated it at Xiuduo Temple in Ganzhou” (Chin. *shamen facheng yu ganzhou xiuduosi yi* 沙門法成於甘州修多寺譯).<sup>83</sup> According to S. 5010, the translation was finished on April 16, in a *renxu* (壬戌) year (possibly 842), at Xiuduo Temple (修多寺) in Ganzhou (甘州).<sup>84</sup> It is interesting to note that Chödrup was only addressed as Monk Chödrup (Chin. *shamen facheng* 沙門法成), and his affiliation with the Tibetan Empire is not mentioned at all. It seems likely that his affiliation with the Tibetan Empire was deliberately erased by the copyist, who lived later in time, during the Guiyijun period.

The *Grahamātrkādhāraṇī* is available in multiple Tibetan translations<sup>85</sup> and Sanskrit editions.<sup>86</sup> I tend to believe Chödrup’s translation was, at least

<sup>83</sup> This text is found in more than fifty Dunhuang manuscripts (Dang Cuo 黨措, “*Zhuxingmu tuoluoni jing* de mizhou jiedu ji neirong jixi 《諸星母陀羅尼經》的密咒解讀及內容解析 [The Analysis of the Mantra Section of the *Grahamātrkādhāraṇī*],” *Zongjiaoxue yanjiu* 宗教學研究 / *Religious Studies* 2011.1 (2011): 263). Among them, Chödrup’s translatorship is frequently mentioned (e.g., P. 3548, P. 4587, BD1164, and BD1957). It may be noted that P. 4587 records that the copying of the *sūtra* was conducted on May 26 of the year 857 (Chin. *dazhong shiyi nian* 大中十一年) by a person named Yang Yingde (fl. 9th c., 陽英德).

<sup>84</sup> S. 5010: 壬戌年四月十六日於甘州脩多寺翻譯此經. The same colophon is also found in BD2315. Moreover, the name Wang Zhuan (王顛), possibly that of the copyist, is written after the colophon.

<sup>85</sup> There are two Kangyur editions: (1) ‘*Phags ma gza’ rnam s ky i yum shes bya ba’ i gzungs* (Skt. *Āryagrahamātrkādhāraṇī*, Derge 660, ‘gyur, ba, 180b5–183b4), which is said to be a revision made by Dragpa Gyaltsen (1147–1216, Tib. Grags pa rgyal mtshan) based on an earlier translation finished in the imperial era; (2) *Gza’ rnam s ky i yum shes bya ba’ i gzungs* (Skt. *Grahamātrkādhāraṇī*, Derge 661, ‘gyur, ba, 183b5–186a4), an anonymous translation. Since Derge 661 is basically the same as the version contained in P. T. 410 and 411, it is likely an earlier version than Derge 660. When we compare Derge 660 with Derge 661, it is immediately observable that they share much content. It is therefore plausible that Derge 661 was the earlier version revised by Dragpa Gyaltsen. In my quick textual comparison, I use Derge 661/P. T. 410 in discussing the Tibetan parallel to Chödrup’s Chinese translation.

<sup>86</sup> Two Sanskrit editions and one Sanskrit manuscript are consulted by Bill Mak, “The Transmission of the *Grahamātrkādhāraṇī* and Other Buddhist Planetary Astral Texts,” *Pacific World* 20 (2018): 228. I mainly use the *Āryagrahamātrkādhāraṇī* (*dhīh* edition)

partially, translated directly from Sanskrit, based on some sporadic observations: for instance, in the Chinese translation 諸天及龍藥叉羅刹乾闥婆阿須羅迦樓羅緊那羅莫呼落迦諸魔日月熒或太白鎮星餘星歲星羅睺長尾星神二十八宿諸大眾等, the initial *zhu* (諸) is a superfluous plural marker in Chinese, and may reflect the initial *aneka* of the Sanskrit compound;<sup>87</sup> in another instance, the Chinese *qingbai fanxing* (清白梵行) is a translation of the Sanskrit *pariśuddhaparyavadātam brahmācāryam*, which is missing in the available Tibetan translations. A more reliable conclusion can only be achieved after more solid philological work has been done.

### 2.2.3 *Sapoduo zong wushi lun* 薩婆多宗五事論 [The Treatise on the Five-Categorised Substances of the Sarvāstivāda School] (*Skt. Pañcavastuka*, attributed to Vasumitra; P. 2073 and P. 2116)

According to the colophon of P. 2073, this treatise was translated by Chödrup in Ganzhou in the *bingyin* (丙寅) year (846).<sup>88</sup> This was the period when Dunhuang was still ruled by the Tibetan Empire, and therefore we see Chödrup's affiliation with the Tibetan Empire clearly stated in the title colophon of both P. 2073 and P. 2116: "Translated by the great, venerable *tripitakācārya* [and] monk Chödrup of the Great Tibetan Empire, in the precinct of Xiuduo Temple in Ganzhou" (Chin. *dafanguo dade sanzang fashi shamen facheng yu Ganzhou xiuduo si daochang yi* 大蕃國大德三藏法師沙門法成於甘州脩多寺道場譯).

The *Pañcavastuka* displays a close textual affinity to the *Bian wushi* 辨五事品 [\**Pañcavastu*] chapter of the *Pinlei zu lun* 品類足論 [\**Abhidharmaprakaraṇapāda*] (T. 1542.26), translated by Xuanzang.<sup>89</sup> Maeda Yosinari argues that the *Pañcavastuka* may have been circulated separately before it was incorporated into the

---

mentioned in Mak's publication. See Ngawang Samten and Janardan Pandey, ed., *Dhīh* 39 (2005): 169–176.

<sup>87</sup> *Dhīh* 39, 171: *anekadevanāgayakṣarākṣasagandharvāsuvāgaruḍakinnaramahoragāpasmārādityasomāgārabudhabṛhaspatiśukraśaṇiścararāhuketvādibhiḥ*.

<sup>88</sup> P. 2073: "Translated on May 15, in the year of *bingyin*, in Zhangye County of Ganzhou Prefecture in the Great Tibetan Empire" (Chin. *bingyin nian wuyue shiwu ri yu da fanguo ganzhou zhangyexian yi* 丙寅年五月十五日於大蕃國甘州張掖縣譯).

<sup>89</sup> For the structure of the *Abhidharmaprakaraṇapāda*, cf. Charles Willemsen, Bart Dessein, and Collett Cox, *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism* (Brill: Leiden, 1998), 214–215.



*Abhidharmaparakaraṇapāda*.<sup>90</sup> Judging from the large number of shared phrases, Chödrup must have consulted Xuanzang's rendition of the *Pañcavastu* chapter of the *Abhidharmaparakaraṇapāda* for his own translation.

The *Pañcavastuka* occurs together with the commentary *Pañcavastukavibhāṣā* (Chin. *Wushi piposha lun* 五事毘婆沙論, T. 1555.28, translated into Chinese by Xuanzang) in the same Sanskrit manuscript from Turfan.<sup>91</sup> As suggested by Ueyama, this discovery may explain Chödrup's motivation for translating the text into Chinese:<sup>92</sup> Chödrup may have received access to a Sanskrit manuscript containing both the *Pañcavastuka* and the *Pañcavastukavibhāṣā*. Since Xuanzang had only translated the *Pañcavastukavibhāṣā*, Chödrup took the initiative to translate the root text, as he may not have known of the earlier Chinese translation of the *Pañcavastuka*, the *Apitan wufa xing jing* 阿毘曇五法行經 [*\*Abhidharmapañcavastukasūtra*] (T. 1557.28), attributed to An Shigao (fl. ca. 148–168, 安世高).<sup>93</sup> An Shigao's translation seems not to have been circulated in Dunhuang, as no manuscript containing this translation has yet been identified.

#### 2.2.4 *Pusa lüyi ershisong* 菩薩律儀二十頌 [Verses on the Twenty Bodhisattva Precepts] (*Skt. Bodhisattvasaṃvaraviṃśaka*)

This is only attested in P. 3950, in which another of Chödrup's Chinese translations, *Ba zhuan shengsong* 八轉聲頌 [Verses on the Application of the Eight Nominal Cases; abbr. Eight Nominal Cases] (see discussion below), was also copied. The title colophons of both texts confirm Chödrup's translatorship: "Translated by the great, venerable

<sup>90</sup> Maeda Yosinari 前田至成, "Goji bibasharon no kei-fu ni suite 五事毘婆沙論の系譜について [On the Genealogy of the *Pañcavastuka*]," *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛敎學研究 / *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 34.1 (1985): 242–249.

<sup>91</sup> Junichi Imanishi, *Das Pancavastukam und die Pancavastukavibhāṣā*, *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, I, Philologisch-historische Klasse* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969); Jil-il Chung and Takanori Fukita, *Sanskrit Fragments of the Pañcavastuka* (Tokyo: Sankibo Press, 2007), 8. Among the seventeen Sanskrit fragments of this text, the manuscript numbered SHT1808 used in Jil-il Chung and Takanori Fukita's edition comprises both the *Pañcavastuka* and *Pañcavastukavibhāṣā*.

<sup>92</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 176.

<sup>93</sup> Haneda Tōru and Paul Pelliot, *Manuscrits de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris, Série in-octavo I–IX* (Kyōto: Tōa kōkyūkai, 1926), 6.

*tripitakācārya* Chödrup of the empire<sup>94</sup> (Chin. *guo dade sanzang fashi facheng yi* 國大德三藏法師法成譯). This work may have been translated during the reign of the Guiyijun, firstly because the colophon does not mention Tibet in Chödrup's official affiliation, and secondly because of the close association between this work and Chödrup's *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* lectures (as will be discussed immediately below), the latter of which took place mainly in the Guiyijun period.

The *Bodhisattvasaṃvaraviṃśaka* represents one of the mainstream Bodhisattva precepts in ancient Tibet.<sup>95</sup> Its author is the Yogācāra scholar Candragomin (fl. ca. 570–670),<sup>96</sup> transcribed as Zanduoluo juming (贊多囉具名), who is addressed with the honorary title bodhisattva (Chin. *pusa* 菩薩) in Chödrup's Chinese translation.<sup>97</sup> Its Tibetan translation is entitled *Byang chub sems dpa'i sdom pa nyi shu pa* [Bodhisattva Precepts] (Derge 4081). The Tengyurs contain two commentaries on this text, one being a *vṛtti* (Derge 4082) attributed to Śāntirakṣita (725–788), the other a *pañjikā* (Derge 4083) attributed to Bodhibhadra (fl. 10th c.).<sup>98</sup>

In Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts, the root text is partially preserved in an incomplete commentary (IOL Tib J 633). The preserved passages, which covers the title and the first verse of the root text, is quoted in red. According to the introduction of IOL Tib J 633, the *Bodhisattvasaṃvaraviṃśaka* was collected by Candragomin “from the sayings of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, composed by the master, the noble

---

<sup>94</sup> I could not determine whether Chödrup translated the text during the Tibetan Empire or the ensuing Guiyijun period. In fact, I think the writer of the manuscript intentionally makes it ambiguous by simply referring to *guo* (empire). It might have been produced in the transition between the Tibetan Empire and the Guiyijun rule over Dunhuang.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Mark Tatz, *Candragomin and the Bodhisattva Vow* (PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 1978), 226–235; David Seyfard Ruegg, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1981), 93, 109.

<sup>96</sup> Mark Tatz, “The Life of Candragomin in Tibetan Historical Tradition,” *The Tibet Journal* 7.3 (1982): 3–22.

<sup>97</sup> In the *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳 [Records of the Inner Law Sent Home from the Southern Sea], Yijing also compared Candragomin to a *bodhisattva*, T. 2125.54, 229c4–6: “In Eastern India there lived a great being named Candragomin, who was a bodhisattva-like person endowed with great talents. He was still alive when Yijing arrived there.” (Chin. 於東印度有一大士名曰月官, 是大才雄菩薩人也, 淨到之日其人尚存).

<sup>98</sup> For his biography, see Seyfard Ruegg, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*, 109.



Asaṅga.”<sup>99</sup> Since Chödrup had actively lectured on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* in Dunhuang, Ueyama<sup>100</sup> surmises that Chödrup may have been inspired to translate the *Bodhisattvasaṃvaraviṃśaka* into Chinese to facilitate his lectures on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*.<sup>101</sup>

There are several discrepancies between the text preserved in IOL Tib J 633 and that of Derge 4081.<sup>102</sup> When comparing Chödrup’s Chinese translation<sup>103</sup> with the two Tibetan versions (IOL Tib J 633 and Derge 4081), we find it is closer to the Dunhuang version,<sup>104</sup> despite several obvious variances. A possible hypothesis to explain these variances is that Chödrup’s Chinese seems to have relied on the Tibetan version of the bodhisattva precept chapter (Skt. *śīlapaṭala*) of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* (Derge 4037).<sup>105</sup> Further philological studies are

<sup>99</sup> IOL Tib J 633 1v3: *slobs dpon/ a rya a sang 'gas rnal 'byol spyod pa'i sa'i nang du gsungs pa las/ tsan dra go myis bsdus ste gsungs so.*

<sup>100</sup> Cf. also Tatz, *Candragomin and the Bodhisattva Vow*, 221.

<sup>101</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 179.

<sup>102</sup> There are three variations between the IOL Tib J 633 and Derge 4081 (*mdo 'grel [sems tsam], hi, 166b1–3*):

(1) In the fourth *pāda* of the first verse, IOL Tib J 633 reads *byang cub sems dpa'i tshul khrims gang*, while Derge 4081/4082/4083 reads *byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyi khrims*;

(2) In the third and fourth *pādas* of the second verse, IOL Tib J 633 reads *btsun ba mkhas shing nus ldan ba// sdom la gnas las blang bar bya* instead of *bla ma sdom la gnas shing mkhas// nus dang ldan las blang bar bya* as found in Derge 4081/4082/4083;

(3) In the second *pāda* of the third verse, IOL Tib J 633 reads *sangs rgyas* in contrast to the Tengyur version’s *rgyal ba*.

<sup>103</sup> The Chinese parallel to the first three verses in the Tibetan version reads: 諸佛並佛子，隨力敬禮養，一切方及時，所有菩薩[\*戒]。福德珍寶藏，彼以勝思心，從尊有智德，具戒人所受。爾時彼善故，最勝及佛子，常當以善心，如念於愛子。(\*戒: the manuscript is damaged here, and I reconstruct *jie* (戒) based on the reading of *khrims* in Derge 4081 and *tshul khrims* in IOL Tib J 633).

<sup>104</sup> For instance, *suoyou pusa jie* (所有菩薩戒 “all bodhisattva precepts”) seems to be a translation of the Dunhuang version’s *byang cub sems dpa'i tshul khrims gang* (“all bodhisattva precepts” where *gang* means “complete”; IOL Tib J 633); moreover, *congzun you zhide, jujie ren suoshou* (從尊有智德，具戒人所受 “from the venerable who possess insight and virtue, received by those with precept”) agrees better, if not completely, with the Dunhuang version’s *btsun ba mkhas shing nus ldan ba// sdom la gnas las blang bar bya* (while *cong* 從 (“from”) remains a problem, *zun* 尊 = *btsun ba*; *jujie* 具戒 = *sdom la gnas*; *suoshou* 所受 = *blang bar bar bya*).

<sup>105</sup> Interestingly, when comparing the second verse of Chödrup’s Chinese translation to the *bodhisattva* precept chapter (Skt. *śīlapaṭala*) of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* (Derge 4037), it seems that Chödrup’s Chinese translation reflects its *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* parallel faithfully, containing some elements that are missing in the available Tibetan versions of the *Bodhisattvasaṃvaraviṃśaka*. For instance, Chinese *you zhide* (有智德 “possessing

needed to clarify from which sources Chödrup made the Chinese translation.

### 2.2.5 *Ba zhuan shengsong* 八轉聲頌 [Verses on the Application of the Eight Nominal Cases; *abbr.* Eight Nominal Cases]

The text was copied together with the *Bodhisattvasaṃvaraviṃśaka* in P. 3950, in which Chödrup's translatorship is confirmed by the title colophon: "Translated by the great, venerable *tripītakācārya* Chödrup of the empire" (Chin. *guo dade sanzang fashi facheng yi* 國大德三藏法師法成譯). Elsewhere, it is attested on the verso of Beida 245,<sup>106</sup> whose author is indicated as Wu Sanzang (吳三藏, *tripītakācārya* Wu). As we have observed in Chödrup's translation of the *Bodhisattvasaṃvaraviṃśaka*, the translation of the *Eight Nominal Cases* was also closely associated with Chödrup's lectures on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*. This is because a copy of the Tibetan *Eight Nominal Cases* was discovered on the backside of Chödrup's lecture notes on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* (P. 2061 = P. T. 783). However, as already noticed by Verhagen,<sup>107</sup> the eightfold nominal declension system (Chin. *ba zhuan* 八轉 / 轉) was not commonly used by Indian scholars. In comparison, this system was mentioned frequently in Chinese translations of the seventh and early eighth centuries, especially by Xuanzang's disciples.<sup>108</sup> If IOL Tib J 625 was not mistaken in stating that the Tibetan

---

insight and virtue") in the second verse does not agree with its Tibetan parallel in IOL Tib J 633 where it reads *mkhas shing nus ldan ba* ("possessing skillfulness and capability"), but is possibly condensed from the parallel in the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*: *ye shes dang/ mthu chen po thob pa [...]* *de dag gi yon tan rnam kyang mngon sum du byas pa* ("Having attained insight and great power [...] have actualised their virtues") of the *Yogācārabhūmi* (Derge 4037, *mdo 'grel [sems tsam]*, wi 82a–84a 82b2).

<sup>106</sup> *Beijing daxue tushuguan cang dunhuang wenxian 2* 北京大學圖書館藏敦煌文獻 2 [Dunhuang Manuscripts Collected in Peking University Library 2] (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1995), 265.

<sup>107</sup> Verhagen ("A Ninth-Century Tibetan Summary of the Indo-Tibetan Model of Case-Semantics," 836) mentions that Sanskrit indigenous grammar usually adopts a sevenfold system, listing the vocative under the rubric of nominative. The *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* actually speaks of a sevenfold system, not eightfold, in agreement with the mainstream Indian grammatical traditions.

<sup>108</sup> For instance, Kuiji/Ji's *Yujia shidi lun luezuān* 瑜伽師地論略纂 [A Compilation of Concise Explanation on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*] (T. 1829.43, 95b14) and Huili's (615–?, 慧立) *Datang da ci'en si sanzang fashi zhuan* 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳 [Biography of the Tripitaka Master of Great Ci'en Monastery of the Great Tang] (T. 2053.50, 239b16). The eightfold declension of Sanskrit is also attested in Yijing's translation of the



was translated from the Chinese (Tib. *rgya 'I dpe las bsgyur*), it is possible that the Chinese source (Tib. *rgya 'I dpe*) here is not a specific reference to the Chinese version of the *Eight Nominal Cases*, but generally refers to Chinese sources in which the eightfold nominal declension system was transmitted. Chödrup may have translated (or composed) the Tibetan *Eight Nominal Cases* to clarify the eightfold declension for his *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* lectures, as the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* adopts a sevenfold declension system.<sup>109</sup>

Regardless of whether the Tibetan version was translated from or composed based on Chinese sources, I strongly believe that Chödrup's Chinese *Eight Nominal Cases* was actually translated from the Tibetan version. This is because the Chinese *Eight Nominal Cases* is not comprehensible unless we read it as a translation from Tibetan. For instance, two sentences from the third *pāda* read *dier zhi shiye, disan zuo zuozhe* (第二知是業, 第三作作者), which seems to be a word-for-word translation of the Tibetan parallel (Tib. *gnyis pa las su shes par bya/ gsum pa byed pa 'I byed po yin*).<sup>110</sup>

### 2.2.6 *Shijia mouni rulai xiangfa miejin zhi ji* 釋迦牟尼如來像法滅盡之記 [Records on the Demise of the Semblance Dharma of Tathāgata Śākyamuni] (P. 2139)

P. 2139 preserves the title colophon: “Translated by the great, venerable *tripiṭakācārya* Chödrup of the empire” (Chin. *guo dade sanzang fashi facheng yi* 國大德三藏法師法成譯). This Chinese version is actually a translation of the Tibetan text *Li yul gyi dgra bcom pas lung bstan pa* [Prophecy of the Arhat from the Li Country], which is attested in

---

*Mūlasarvāstivādinayasamgraha* of Viśeṣamitra (fl. 6th or 7th c.?) (*genben sapoduo bu lü she* 根本薩婆多部律攝, T. 1458.24, 532b7–8). I have not yet identified the same term in the Tibetan version *'Dul ba bsdus pa* (Derge 4105). On Viśeṣamitra, see Shayne Clarke, “The *'Dul bar byed pa (Vinītaka)* Case-Law Section of the *Mūlasarvāstivādin Uttaragrantha*,” *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 20 (2016): 52–53.

<sup>109</sup> From the second fascicle of Xuanzang's translation of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, T. 1579.30, 289c1–3: 又有七言論句, 此即七例句。謂補盧沙, 補盧衫, 補盧毘拏, 補盧沙耶, 補盧沙頰, 補盧殺姿, 補盧鍛, 如是等。

<sup>110</sup> Verhagen (“A Ninth-Century Tibetan Summary of the Indo-Tibetan Model of Case-Semantics,” 834) translates the Tibetan as “The second [= accusative case] should be considered as [making] the direct object; The third [= instrumental case marks] the agent of the action.”



Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts IOL Tib J 597, IOL Tib J 598, and IOL Tib J 601.2,<sup>111</sup> as well as in the first chapter of the *Li'i yul lung bstan pa* [Prophecy of the Li Country] (Derge 4202).<sup>112</sup> It is remarkable that this title of Chödrup only mentions 'guo' (國) (of the empire/of the state), without specifying whether it was the Great Tibetan Empire (Chin. *Da fanguo* 大蕃國) or the succeeding Guiyijun government. I speculate that this distinctive title reflects the period following the end of the Tibetan Empire's rule of Dunhuang, during which new administrative structures had yet to be fully implemented. Consequently, people may have continued to employ old titles, adhering to established conventions even as political dynamics evolved. It is plausible that individuals addressed Chödrup using the old title, albeit with modifications, omitting references to the Tibetan Empire.

2.2.7–8 *Yinyuan xinlun song* 因緣心論頌 [Verse from the Treatise on the Heart of Causation] (*Pratītyasamutpādaḥṛdayakārikā*) and *Yinyuan xinlun shi* 因緣心論釋 [Commentary to the Treatise on the Heart of Causation] (*Pratītyasamutpādaḥṛdayavyākhyāna*) (T. 1654.32).

The possibility that these two texts were translated by Chödrup from the Tibetan translations of Nāgārjuna's *Pratītyasamutpādaḥṛdayakārikā* (Derge 3836) and its autocommentary, *Pratītyasamutpādaḥṛdayavyākhyāna* (Derge 3837)<sup>113</sup> was first proposed

---

<sup>111</sup> Zhu Lishuang 朱丽双, "Yutian aluohan shouji duikan yu yanjiu 于阗阿罗汉授记对勘与研究 [Comparisons and Studies of the *Li yul gyi dgra bcom pas lung bstan pa*]," in *Zhang Guangda xiansheng bashi huadan zhushou lunwen ji* 张广达先生八十华诞祝寿论文集 [Festschrift for the Eightieth Birthday of Professor Zhang Guangda] (Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 2010), 605–676. As pointed out by Zhu Lishuang, *Li yul gyi dgra bcom pas lung bstan pa* was first circulated as an independent text, and later incorporated into the *Li'i yul lung bstan pa*. See also Ronald Eric Emmerick, *Tibetan Texts Concerning Khotan* (London: Oxford University, 1967), B.

<sup>112</sup> Haneda Tōru and Paul Pelliot, *Manuscrits de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris, Série in-folio I–IV* (Kyoto: Tōa kōkyūkai, 1926), 31. Also see Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 183.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 203. Nāgārjuna's *Verse* and *Autocommentary* are also found in Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts such as P. T. 769 and IOL Tib J 621 and IOL Tib J 622. Cf. Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 209; Cristina Scherrer-Schaub, "D'un manuscrit tibétain des *Pratītyasamutpādaḥṛdayakārikā* de Nāgārjuna," *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 3 (1987): 103–111. The Sanskrit version from Gilgit is edited in Gokhale, Vasudev, "Encore: The *Pratītyasamutpādaḥṛdaya-kārikā* of Nāgārjuna," in *Principal V. S. Apte Commemoration Volume* (Pune: Deccan Education Society, 1978), 62–68. See also, Gyaltzen Namdol,



by Vasudev Gokhale, on the basis of the observation that the Chinese and the Tibetan versions are almost completely identical.<sup>114</sup> Howard Masang's most recent publication on this text tends to agree with this authorship attribution.<sup>115</sup>

### 3. Chödrup as a Commentator and Lecturer

Apart from taking charge of bilingual or even trilingual translation projects, Chödrup was also active in several local monasteries in Shazhou (attested between 813 and 838, and again from 855 until his passing shortly before 865) and Ganzhou (between the 840s and 850s) where he composed numerous commentaries and gave lectures. Below is a list of commentaries plausibly attributed to him.<sup>116</sup>

---

*Pratīyasamutpādahṛdaya* and *Āryadharmadhātugarbhavivarāṇa* of *Ācārya Nāgārjuna* (Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1997), 29.

<sup>114</sup> Vasudev Gokhale, *Pratīyasamutpādaśāstra des Ullaṅgha: kritisch behandelt und aus dem Chinesischen ins Deutsche übertragen* (PhD diss., University of Bonn, 1930), 4: "Vergleicht man zunächst die letzteren zwei Versionen: B1 und B2 miteinander, so sieht hier man deutlich, dass die beiden bis auf einzelne Worte völlig identisch sind, so dass man bei der Behauptung kaum fehl gehen wird, dass die eine direkt aus der anderen übertragen worden ist. Zudem weisen einige Stellen mit gleicher Bestimmtheit darauf hin, dass eben die tibetische Version für die neuerdings aus Tun-huang gerettete chinesische Übersetzung grundlegend gewesen ist. Diese tibeto-chinesische Version enthält also einen Grundtext, der aus sieben Strophen besteht, nebst einem Kommentar, der von den sieben Strophen nur die oben erwähnten fünf erklärt, die beiden übrigen dagegen am Schlusse einfach anfügt. Dass unter den vier angeführten Versionen B2 die letzte und B1 die vorletzte Version darstellt, bedarf wohl keines besonderen Nachweises, da bekanntlich die zweite Hälfte des 7. Jahr-hunderts als die Anfangszeit der tibetischen Übersetzungsliteratur anzusetzen ist." Gokhale (ibid. n.1) argues that the Tibetan version serves the source for the Chinese version (T. 1654.32), because, in the fifth verse, the Tibetan places 'me long' (mirror) in front of 'rgya' (*muḍrā*) for metric reasons in Tibetan, and this alternation is reflected in the Chinese version.

<sup>115</sup> Meghan Howard Masang, "Sino-Tibetan Scholasticism," 305.

<sup>116</sup> There is a noticeable pattern in terms of the transmission of the following *sūtras*, namely, the root text was transmitted together with its commentaries. This reminds us of Skilling's hypothesis on the early transmission of Mahāyāna *sūtras* in Tibet: "Both longer and shorter 'miscellaneous *sūtras* and *śāstras*' may originally have been transmitted in single volumes: there is some evidence of this from Tun huang, where there is also at least one example of a *sūtra* [i.e., *Caturdharmakanāmamahāyānasūtra*] being transmitted in the same manuscript with its commentaries." Peter Skilling, "From *bKa' bstan* to *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*," in *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon: Papers Presented at a Panel of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995*, ed. Helmut Eimer (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997), 97.

*BuddhistRoad Paper* 1.3. Li, "Toward a History of Chödrup's Monastic Activities"

### 3.1 Lecture Notes on the *Śālistambasūtra*

The textual group of the ‘Lecture Notes on the *Śālistambasūtra*’ includes (1) the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shu* 大乘稻苳經隨聽疏 [Lecture Notes on the *Śālistambasūtra*] (e.g., P. 2284, P. 2303, P. 2583); (2) the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shoujingji* 大乘稻苳經隨聽手鏡記 [The Hand Mirror of the Lecture Notes on the the *Śālistambasūtra*; abbr. Hand Mirror of the *Śālistambasūtra*] (e.g., P. 2303r; P. T. 113V, P. 2569);<sup>117</sup> and possibly (3) the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shujue* 大乘稻苳經隨聽疏決 [Exegesis on the Lecture Notes on the *Śālistambasūtra*; abbr. Exegesis on the *Śālistambasūtra*] (e.g., P. 2328).<sup>118</sup> They contain Chödrup’s teachings on the *Śālistambasūtra* [The Rice Stalk Sūtra], namely the *Dasheng daogan jing* 大乘稻苳經 [The Mahāyāna Sūtra of Śālistamba] and the commentary composed by Kamalaśīla (ca. 740–795).<sup>119</sup> According to Dunhuang manuscript colophons, Chödrup lectured multiple times in

---

<sup>117</sup> When we compare the text of the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shoujingji* to that of the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shu*, we find that the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shoujingji* is actually part of the latter text. We also observe that the two titles are sometimes used without much distinction. For instance, in the manuscript BD15358, the whole scroll is entitled the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shu*, but the actual content is *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shoujingji*; in contrast, in P. 2284, the whole scroll is entitled the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shoujingji*, but the real text is the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shu*.

Manuscript P. 2303 contains both the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shu* and the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shoujingji*. The title colophon of the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shu* states that it was Chödrup who compiled the text (Chin. *shamen facheng ji* 沙門法成集). Interestingly, the title colophon of the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shoujingji* rather states that Chödrup was the translator of the text (Chin. *shamen facheng yi* 沙門法成譯).

<sup>118</sup> Wu Qiyu (“Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi hōjō denkō,” 389–390) surmises that the two texts contained in P. 2328, namely, the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shujue* and the second text, the *Dasheng baifa suiting shouchao* 大乘百法隨聽手抄 [The Handwritten Lecture Notes for the Mahāyāna Sūtra on the One Hundred Phenomena] (abbr. Lecture Notes on the Hundred Phenomena), were both written in Chödrup’s lectures. The latter text is the lecture notes on the *Dasheng baifa mingmen lun* 大乘百法明門論 [The Lucid Introduction on the Mahāyāna Sūtra on the One Hundred Phenomena] (Skt. *Śatadharmaprakāśamukhaśāstra*), composed by Vasubandhu and translated by Xuanzang.

<sup>119</sup> Yoshimura, “Kamarashīra zō tōgankyōshaku hōjō yaku no suitei,” 128–129. He has argued that Chödrup’s commentary on the *Śālistambasūtra* was based on Kamalaśīla’s commentary *’Phags pa sā lu ljang pa rgya cher ’grel pa* [Extensive Commentary on the Nobel Mahāyāna Sūtra of the Rice Stalk] (Skt. *Śālistambakaṭikā*, Derge 4001). Cf. also Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 212.



Shazhou. As stated in P. 2328, Chödrup started lecturing before 813.<sup>120</sup> Later, in the *guimao* (癸卯) year, namely 823, he started lecturing once again, as attested in BD6205, written at Yongshou Temple (永壽寺),<sup>121</sup> and in the verso of P. 2912.<sup>122</sup> Around 838, he may have conducted another round of preaching on the *Śālistambasūtra*, as recorded in manuscript Dx 302, a copy of the *Hand Mirror of the Śālistambasūtra* made in the *xuwu* (戊午) year (838). Some student monks who attended Chödrup's lectures came from Yongkang Temple (永康寺) (P. 2284).<sup>123</sup> In the year 858, he resided at Kaiyuan Temple (開元寺) in Dunhuang and again

<sup>120</sup> The colophon of P. 2328 contains several clear dates: “On the eighth of the first month of the year 813, the lecture started from the very beginning. It was completed on the fifteenth of February. Again, it was reconducted from the eighth of December, 814, to the thirtieth of January, 815, and lasted for fifty-two days. Compared to the previous lecture, this one was delayed by fourteen days.” (癸巳年 [(813)] 正月八日起首說論, 至二月十五日終畢記。又復休(?)從甲午年 [(814)] 十二月八日起首, 至乙未年 [(815)] 正月卅日了, 計五十二日。按前一十四日遲)。

<sup>121</sup> BD6205: “It was copied on the tenth of October, in the *guimao* year [823], at Yongshou Temple.” (癸卯年十月十日永壽寺寫)。Ikeda On 池田温, *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku* 中國古代寫本識語集錄 [Collected Colophons of Ancient Chinese Manuscripts] (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Bunka Kenkyūjo, 1990), no. 1027.

<sup>122</sup> P. 2912 verso: “On the fourth of November, of the *mao* year [823], the lecture on the *Śālistambasūtra* was conducted for one round and finished.” (卯年十一月四日說稻釋經一遍訖)。

The verso of the manuscript mentions a monastery administrator named Song Zhengqin (fl. 9th c., 宋正勤) and a *mao* (卯) year. According to Masaaki Chikusa 竺沙雅章, *Chūgoku bukkyō shakaishi kenkyū* 中國佛教社會史研究 [Studies on the Social History of Buddhism in China] (Kyoto: Dōhōshā, 1982), 365, the name Zhengqin also appears in two other manuscripts, S. 3920v and BD6359, that are dated to 815 and 821, respectively. In addition, on this very verso, a monk named Xuan (fl. 9th c., 炫和尚) signed his name on a list of donations for copying scriptures. According to Zheng Binglin (郑炳林), this monk Xuan became the head of the Buddhist *saṃgha* in Dunhuang in 825 and died in 833. Zheng Binglin 郑炳林, “Dujiaoshou Zhang Jinxuan heshang shengping shiji kao 都教授张金炫和尚生平事迹考 [A Study of the Life Activities of the Head Monk Zhang Jinxuan],” *Dunhuang yanjiu* 敦煌研究 / *Journal of the Dunhuang Studies* 31 (1997): 96–102. Combining the above discussions, the *mao* year was most possibly 823.

<sup>123</sup> P. 2284: “The junior monk Fujian from Yongkang Temple has received and is proficient in [the teaching of] the *Śālistambasūtra* as well as in meditation, and masters their full meanings.” (永康寺後輩法律比丘福漸受持并兼通稻苳及坐禪并具足義)。BD3355 includes a copy of the *Śālistambasūtra* and the *Dasheng sifa jing lun ji guangshi kaijie ji* 大乘四法經論及廣釋開決記 [Exegetical Notes on the *Caturdharmaśāstra*, the Commentary, and the Subcommentary] with marks in red, possibly used during Chödrup's lectures. This manuscript states that the manuscript was copied by a Vinaya Master named Shenxi (fl. 9–10 c., 神希) based at Yongkang Temple.

lectured on the *Śālistambasūtra* (S. 5309 and P. 2304).<sup>124</sup> After his death, the *Hand Mirror of the Śālistambasūtra* was still copied and circulated (e.g., P. 2208, dated to 859).<sup>125</sup>

3.2 *The Textual Group Dasheng sifa jing lun ji guangshi kaijue ji* 大乘四法經論及廣釋開決記 [Exegetical Notes on the *Caturdharmakanāmahāyānasūtra*, the Commentary, and the Subcommentary, abbr. Exegetical Notes on the *Caturdharmakasūtra*] (e.g., P. 2794, P. 3007, BD 3530, etc.)<sup>126</sup>

This contains a substantial exegesis of three works, namely, the *Dasheng sifa jing* 大乘四法經 [The Mahāyāna Sūtra of the Four Teachings] (*Caturdharmakanāmahāyānasūtra*),<sup>127</sup> its commentary by Vasubandhu, and the subcommentary by Zhiwei (d.u., 智威, Skt. Jñānadatta).<sup>128</sup>

<sup>124</sup> S. 5309: “Monk Heng’an attended the complete [lecture]. The great, venerable *tripīṭakācārya* of the Empire, Chōdrup, lectured at Kaiyuan Temple in Shazhou on June 22, 857.” (比丘恆安隨聽了。大中十一年 [857] 歲次丁丑六月廿二日，國大德三藏法師沙門法成於沙州開元寺說畢記)。

P. 2304, the *Dasheng daogan jing suiting shoujingji*, records another monk, named Dabian (fl. 9th c., 大弁), who seems to have attended the same lecture as Heng’an: “Dabian, the Vinaya Master from Kaiyuan Temple, on June 28, 857.” ({}[丑]年六月廿八日開元寺律師比丘大[弁]). While the first character of this sentence is illegible, I am confident that the second character, which looks like a squashed character *san* (三), is actually *chou* (丑). In other words, this manuscript was written only several days after Heng’an’s copy (S. 5309).

<sup>125</sup> Ikeda, *Collected Colophons of Ancient Chinese Manuscripts*, no. 1958.

<sup>126</sup> For a detailed study of Chōdrup’s *Kaijue ji*, cf. Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 188–195.

<sup>127</sup> The Dunhuang Chinese version of the *Dasheng sifa jing* as found in P. 2350v and S. 3194 is not identical with any of the Chinese translations in the Chinese *tripīṭaka* (T. 772–774.17). According to Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 189, the Tibetan parallel of the Dunhuang Chinese version is the *’Phags pa chos bzhi pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po ’i mdo* [The Noble Mahāyāna Sūtra Entitled the Four Teachings] (Derge 251).

<sup>128</sup> Ueyama has identified the Chinese name *zhiwei* (智威) as the translation of Jñānadatta (ibid., 190). The manuscript P. 2350 contains the *sūtra*, the commentary, and the subcommentary, which were possibly used in Chōdrup’s lecture. The commentary by Vasubandhu and the subcommentary by Zhiwei are also found together in Tengyurs. For instance, they are listed as Peking 5490 (*’Phags pa chos bzhi pa ’i rnam par bshad pa* [Exposition on the *Noble Sūtra of the Four Teachings*]) and Peking 5491 (*’Phags pa chos bzhi pa ’i rgya cher bshad pa ’i rgya cher ’grel pa* [Extensive Commentary on the Detailed Exposition on the *Noble Sūtra of the Four Teachings*]). However, the modern Tohoku index of the Derge Kangyur/Tengyur only assigns a number to Vasubandhu’s commentary (Derge 3990), but it fails to recognize Jñānadatta’s subcommentary, which is placed precisely after Vasubandhu’s commentary (Derge 3990) in the Derge Kangyur.



According to the title colophon of P. 2749, this *Exegetical Notes on the Caturdharmakasūtra* was compiled by Chödrup, of the Great Tibetan Empire. The end colophon of the same manuscript informs us that Chödrup's lecture was conducted at Yongkang Temple in August of 833.<sup>129</sup>

3.3 *The Textual Group Liumen tuoluoni jing lun bing guangshi kaijueji* 六門陀羅經論并廣釋開決記 [Exegetical Notes on the *Śaṅmukhīdhāraṇīsūtra*, the Commentary, and the Subcommentary, abbr. Exegetical Notes on the *Śaṅmukhīdhāraṇīsūtra*] (P. 2165, P. 2861).<sup>130</sup>

Just like the above textual group, the *Śaṅmukhīdhāraṇīsūtra* [Sūtra [entitled] the Dhāraṇī of the Six Entrances] was also copied alongside its commentaries: in P. 2404, Xuanzang's translation of the *sūtra*, the *Liumen tuoluoni jing* 六門陀羅尼經 (Skt. *Śaṅmukhīdhāraṇīsūtra*, T.1360.21) was written along with Vasubandhu's commentary *Liumen tuoluoni jing lun* 六門陀羅尼經論 [Commentary on the *Śaṅmukhīdhāraṇīsūtra*] and Zhiwei's subcommentary *Liumen tuoluoni jing lun guangshi* 六門陀羅尼經論廣釋 [Subcommentary on the *Śaṅmukhīdhāraṇīsūtra*]. According to P. 2404, Vasubandhu's commentary and Zhiwei's subcommentary were compiled at Yongkang Temple in 833.<sup>131</sup>

Although no manuscripts have preserved colophons that directly confirm Chödrup's authorship of the *Commentary on the Śaṅmukhīdhāraṇīsūtra*, Ueyama argues that Chödrup was the author for two reasons: firstly, this text demonstrates a close textual affinity with

<sup>129</sup> P. 2794: colophon: "The great, venerable *tripīṭakācārya* of the Great Tibetan Empire, Chödrup" (大蕃國大德三藏法師沙門法成); Ending colophon: "It is noted that the compilation has been completed on the ninth day of the final decade of August, 833, at Yongkang Temple." (癸丑年八月下旬九日於沙州永康寺集畢記).

<sup>130</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 195–203.

<sup>131</sup> P. 2404 contains both Vasubandhu's commentary and Jñānadatta's subcommentary. Its colophon states that these texts were collected and translated at Yongkang Temple in Shazhou on October 8, 833 (癸丑年十月上旬八日, 於沙州永康寺集譯訖, 故記之也).

Vasubandhu's Tibetan commentary can be found in Derge 3989 and is titled '*Phags pa sgo drug pa'i gzungs kyi rnam par bshad pa* [Explanation of the Noble Dhāraṇī of the Six Entrances] (\**Śaṅmukhīdhāraṇīvyākhyāna*; also found in IOL Tib J 428 and P. 417). The Tibetan version of Jñānadatta's subcommentary is only found in IOL Tib J 420 and is titled '*phags pa sgo drug pa'i gzungs kyi rnam par bshad pa rgya cher 'grel pa* [Extensive Commentary on the Exposition on the Noble Dhāraṇī of the Six Entrances] (Skt. \**Śaṅmukhīdhāraṇīvyākhyānaṭīkā*).

Chödrup's *Exegetical Notes on the Caturdharmakasūtra* in terms of exegesis and, secondly, Chödrup resided at precisely the same monastery (Yongkang Monastery) in 833, the compilation year of this textual group.<sup>132</sup>

3.4 *The Yinyuan xin lunshi kaijue ji* 因緣心論釋開決記 [Exegetical Notes on the [Auto-]commentary to the Treatise on the Heart of Causation; abbr. Exegetical Notes on the *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdaya*] (P. 2211, P. 2538, S. 269)

Ueyama speculates that this was also composed by Chödrup, possibly when Chödrup studied the Tibetan translations of Nāgārjuna's *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdayakārikā* (Derge 3836) and its autocommentary, *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdayavyākhyāna* (Derge 3837).<sup>133</sup> Although no direct clues confirming Chödrup's authorship have been preserved in Dunhuang, it can indeed be observed that this group of texts was frequently copied along with other texts attributed to Chödrup (e.g., with the *Dhāraṇī of the Six Entrances* in S. 1513, or with the *Mahāyāna Sūtra of the Four Teachings* in BD3355). Howard Masang provides fresh insights into the parallel between this Chinese text and the several Tibetan commentarial compositions discovered in Dunhuang (P. T. 767, P. T. 762, P. T. 766), in terms of their organisational structures as well as the content they present.<sup>134</sup>

3.5 *Lectures on the Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* [Treatise on the Different Stages of Yogācāra]

Chödrup's lecture series may have started in 855 and continued until 859 in Dunhuang.<sup>135</sup> There are a large number of Dunhuang manuscripts

<sup>132</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 197.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, 203.

<sup>134</sup> Meghan Howard Masang, "Sino-Tibetan Scholasticism," 305. In contrast to my brief overview here, Howard Masang offers a more comprehensive examination of the parallels between the Tibetan and Chinese commentarial compositions of the *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdayakārikā* in Dunhuang. Additionally, her paper includes a more thorough review of previous scholarship on this text.

<sup>135</sup> Xu Jian 徐健, "Tufan gaoseng wu facheng shengping santi 吐蕃高僧吴法成生平三题 [Three Aspects of the Life of the Tibetan Monk Wu Chödrup]," *Dunhuang xue jikan* 敦煌学辑刊 / *Journal of the Dunhuang Studies* 1 (2017): 42 argues that Chödrup lectured one or two volumes per month and possibly stopped after finishing the fifty-sixth volume. Cf.



produced directly from his teachings on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, which can be divided into three genres.<sup>136</sup>

(1) The *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, attributed to Maitreya and translated by Xuanzang (e.g., S. 3927 and S. 5309, which mention Chödrup as the lecturer in their colophons). Manuscripts copied by Mingzhao (fl. mid-9th c., d. after 867, 明照,) mainly belong to this group.

(2) The *Shouji* 手記 [(Handwritten) Lecture Notes], written by the disciples who attended Chödrup's lectures: i.e., S. 6670, S. 4011, and S. 1243 by Tanxun (fl. 9th c., 談迅) and Fuhui (fl. 9th c., 福慧), and another set of manuscripts, including P. 2061, P. 2134, P. 3716, and BD2298, by Fajing (fl. mid-9th c., 法鏡) and Hongzhen (fl. 9th c., 洪真).<sup>137</sup>

Henrik H. Sørensen, "Guiyijun and Buddhism at Dunhuang: A Year by Year Chronicle," 5 for a list of Chödrup's students at his *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* lectures.

<sup>136</sup> I am now preparing a relatively complete list of manuscripts of Chödrup's lectures on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, which, due to its large size, will be published on another occasion. Rong Xinjiang and Yu Xin have also published a paper devoted to the same corpus of the manuscripts containing Chödrup's lectures on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, but they focus on examining the authenticity of the notes concerning the copying dates or venues. They particularly question the historical authenticity of the notes attributed to a monk named Zhihuishan (fl. 9th c., 智慧山). Rong Xinjiang 荣新江 and Yuxin 余欣, "Dunhuang xieben bianwei shili yi fachenjiang Yuqie shidi lun xuesheng biji wei zhongxin 敦煌写本辨伪示例—以法成讲《瑜伽师地论》学生笔记为中心 [Case Studies of How to Identify Fake Records: Centring on the Lecture Notes on Chödrup's *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*]," in *Dunhuang xue riben xue: Harumichi Ishizuka jiaoshou tuiji jinian wenji* 敦煌学·日本学: 石塚晴通教授退職纪念文集 [Dunhuang Studies and Japanology: Festschrift for Professor Harumichi Ishizuka] (Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe, 2005), 65–74.

<sup>137</sup> This set of manuscripts is most frequently associated with the monks Fajing and Hongzhen, who had the habit of intensively signing their names in manuscripts. Textual comparison reveals that the manuscripts of the *Shouji* written by Fajing and Hongzhen are part of the same text, but they are different from Tanxun and Fuhui's *Lecture Notes*. Moreover, one of Fajing's *Lecture Notes* manuscripts (P. 2061 = P. T. 783) contains the Tibetan text *Exposé in Verse Form (on) the Set of Eight Nominal Cases (as They) Occur (in Use)* translated by Chödrup, which was possibly written by Chödrup during his lecture.

However, I am baffled by one of the colophons preserved in the manuscript Shanghai Library 117: 上元元年十月三日說竟 沙門洪真手記訖 ("On October 3, the first year of *shangyuan*, the explanation of [the tenth volume of the *[Handwritten] Lecture Notes*] was finished. Monk Hongzhen wrote it down. Completed.") If this colophon is authentic, we cannot ascribe this text to Chödrup, because the two possible dates for a *shangyuan yuannian* (上元元年) are 680 and 760, both of which predate Chödrup's preaching activities. Nevertheless, I strongly doubt that *shangyuan yuannian* would refer to a year in the 850s (but before 858).

This is because, in BD2298, another manuscript possessed by Hongzhen, the colophon states: 戊寅年後正月廿二日說四十一卷手記竟. This *wuyin* (戊寅) year is no doubt 858



(3–4) The *Fenmen ji* 分門記 [Notes on the Categorised Preaching], written down by Tanxun and Fuhui (e.g., S. 2552, P. 2038, P. 2039, and P. 2122), Yizhen (fl. 9th c., 一真; S. 333 and S. 6788), and Zhihuishan (fl. 9th c., 智慧山),<sup>138</sup> each with colophons confirming Chödrup’s authorship. Compared to the [Handwritten] *Lecture Notes*, which contain Chödrup’s wide-ranging explanations of terminologies, textual structure, doctrines, and so forth, the *Notes on the Categorised Preaching* belong to a more technical exegetical genre that focuses on the division of the text into very detailed categories. To a certain extent, the [Handwritten] *Lecture Notes* could cover the content of the *Notes on the Categorised Preaching* (for instance, P. 2061 [Handwritten] *Lecture Notes* includes parallel passages from P. 2035 *Notes on the Categorised Preaching*).

### 3.6 Chödrup as a Commentator and Lecturer—A Short Summary

In sum, Chödrup’s lectures and commentaries display a strong affinity with the commentarial tradition prevalent in contemporary Tibet, and many of the texts he worked on were not circulating in central China. For instance, his commentarial compositions on the *Ṣaṅmukhīdhāraṅīsūtra* and the *Caturdharmakanāmahāyānasūtra* were based on Vasubandhu’s commentaries and Jñānadatta’s subcommentaries, which had already been translated into Tibetan but not into Chinese by Chödrup’s time. In addition, Chödrup’s commentary on the

---

based on two reasons: (1) Around 858, Chödrup was preaching the forty-first volume of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*. The manuscript f70 contains text from the the forty-second volume of the *Shouji*, written by Mingzhao in exactly the same month of the same year (寅年閏正月廿二日). (2) The identification of the year 858 can also be confirmed by the Dunhuang local calendar, in which the year 858 actually had a [lunar] January as the leap month. Cf. Liu Yongming 劉永明, “Sanjian dunhuang li shuorun jikao 散見敦煌曆朔閏輯考 [Studies and Gathering of the Dunhuang Lunar Calendar Records Scattered across the Dunhuang Manuscripts],” *Dunhuang yanjiu* 敦煌研究 / *Dunhuang Research* 76 (2002): 14. Therefore, Hongzhen must have written the forty-first volume of the *Shouji* in 858, while the year the *shangyuan yuannian* refers to must be further analysed.

Rong Xinjiang and Yu Xin, *Dunhuang xieben bianwei shili*, also questions the record of *shangyuan yuannian* 上元元年 and its historical authenticity. They argue that the handwriting on Shanghai Library 117 is different from that of other manuscripts signed by Hongzhen (洪真), and “traces of forgery [of the colophon] are obvious” (作偽之跡明顯).

<sup>138</sup> Tachibana Zuichō 橘瑞超, “Ribēn jūshī dunhuang jianglāi zāngjīng mùlù 日本橘氏敦煌將來藏經目錄 [The Catalogue of Dunhuang Manuscripts Taken by Tachibana Zuichō to Japan],” in *Congshu jicheng xubian di'erce* 叢書集成續編第二冊 [The Extended Collectanea of Chinese Books, Vol. II] (Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1989), 516.



*Śālistambasūtra* not only comments upon Kamalaśīla's subcommentary (Derge 4001), but also cites the *lTa ba 'I khyad par* [Distinction of Views] (Derge 4360), the work of another Tibetan translator, Yéshé Dé (fl. mid-8th–9th c., Tib. Ye shes sde).<sup>139</sup> Therefore, Ueyama and Wu Qiyu,<sup>140</sup> on the basis of Chödrup's commentaries on the *Śālistamba* and *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, place Chödrup in the tradition of Yogācāra-Madhyamaka, a tradition featuring the synthesis of the Yogācāra tradition with Madhyamaka ideas.<sup>141</sup>

Additionally, Chödrup was an important figure in the transmission and development of Chinese Buddhist teachings in Dunhuang. On the one hand, Chödrup received the teachings of the Ximing lineage of the Chinese Yogācāra School ('Mind-Only School,' Chin. *Weishi zong* 唯識宗, Skt. *Cittamātra*). According to Ueyama, part of Chödrup's *Exegetical Notes on the Caturdharmakasūtra* largely follows the exegetical structure used in the *Jingang jing zhizan* 金剛經旨贊 [Explication of the Gist of the Vajracchedikā], composed by Tankuang in Shuofang (朔方) (administrative centre close to Zhongxing (中興), the later Tangut capital).<sup>142</sup> In addition, Chödrup was quite familiar with the works of Wonch'uk,<sup>143</sup> possibly owing to Tankuang's influence.<sup>144</sup> If we trace Chödrup's doctrinal ideas further back, it is clear that Xuanzang's teachings have also exerted a heavy influence on Chödrup, as clearly

<sup>139</sup> Cf. Ueyama Daishūn, "Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi shamohōjō no kenkyū (jō)," 193–196; David Snellgrove, *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism* (Shambhala: Boston, 2002), 439.

<sup>140</sup> Wu Qiyu, "Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi hōjō denkō," 397: 法成をチベットの中觀瑜伽學派の学者であると見なしても差し支えないであろう ("It would be safe to regard Chödrup as a scholar of Tibetan Yogācāra-Madhyamaka tradition"). Cf. also Ueyama, "Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi shamohōjō no kenkyū (jō)," 197–199.

<sup>141</sup> Moreover, in BD14676, tentatively entitled *Fengchufen wu heshang jinglun* 奉處分吳和尚經論 [The Distribution of Monk Wu's Possession of Sūtras and Śāstras], a large quantity of his private collection consists of Yogācāra (e.g., *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* and *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhiśāstra*) and Madhyamaka treatises (e.g., *Madhyāntavibhāga*). There is also an entry on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (which must be a Tibetan version), a classical Yogācāra-Madhyamaka work. Cf. Ueyama Daishūn, "Go oshō zōsho mokuroku (kō 76) ni tsuite 吳和尚藏書目録(効 76) について [Concerning the Catalogue of Monk Wu's Library]," *Nihon chibetto gakkai kaihō* 日本西藏学会会報 / *Report of the Japanese Association for Tibetan Studies* 41–42 (1997): 3–9.

<sup>142</sup> Li, "Tankuang and His Work in Tibetan Translation," forthcoming.

<sup>143</sup> Chödrup translated Wonch'uk's commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana*; cf. Section 2.1.11.

<sup>144</sup> Cf. John Powers, "Lost in China, Found in Tibet," 98.

demonstrated in his lectures on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* and translations such as the *Pañcavastuka*.

On the other hand, Chödrup's affinity with the Chinese Chan tradition can also be easily recognised. As mentioned above, Chödrup translated the *Lañkāvatārasūtra* into Tibetan based on the lengthy commentary of Wenhui.<sup>145</sup> Moreover, in the colophon of P. 2885, Chödrup is identified as the copyist<sup>146</sup> of the *Jueguan lun* 絕觀論 [Treatise on Transcendence of Cognition]<sup>147</sup>, a Chan text that purports to eliminate all possible conceptual means for soteriological purposes. Further investigation is certainly required to clarify how Chödrup reacted to and choose between the conflicting positions of the Chan tradition and that of Kamalaśīla. It seems plausible that Chödrup did not treat Kamalaśīla and Chinese Chan as two mutually exclusive traditions.<sup>148</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> T. 2812.85, 1069a4. Tankuang also cites from Wenhui's commentary in his *Ascertainment of the Meaning and Revelation of the Tenets of the \*Mahāyānaśāradharmaparakāśamukhaśāstra*). About the textual genre of *Baifa yijue* as a subcommentary, cf. Li, "Tankuang and His Work in Tibetan Translation," forthcoming.

<sup>146</sup> The manuscript colophon reads: "It was written on the sixth day of March of the *xinsi* year [801] by monk Facheng" (*xinsi nian sanyue liuri xiezheng seng facheng* 辛巳年三月六日寫証 僧法成). Two *xinsi* (辛巳) years were possible here, 801 or 861. Since the other side of this manuscript features a text by Tankuang, and Chödrup was an inheritor of Tankuang's teachings (Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkō no kenkyū*, 83, 191), the manuscript was more likely written in 801, when Chödrup was still in his early monkhood as a student (ibid., 95 and Wu Qiyu, "Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi hōjō denkō," 398 holds the same view).

<sup>147</sup> Although this text is traditionally attributed to the legendary Chan master Bodhidharma, Sekiguchi Shindai (關口真大) argues that Farong (法融) may have been the real author. Cf. Sekiguchi Shindai 關口真大, "Daruma oshiyō *zekkan ron* (Tonkō shutsudo) wa gozu hōyū no senjutsu taru o ron zu 達摩和尚絕觀論 (燉煌出土) は牛頭法融の撰述たるを論ず" [Examining the *Jueguan lun* from Dunhuang Attributed to Monk Damo as Being Written by Farong of the Oxhead School], *Indogaku bukkōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 / *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 5.1 (1957): 208–211.

<sup>148</sup> Take the aforementioned Chan work *Jueguan lun* as an example. The intent of this Chan work is to eliminate all possible conceptual means in order to realise the nonconceptual gnosis of emptiness, and as a copyist, Chödrup should have been quite familiar with this position. At the same time, Chödrup also acknowledges Kamalaśīla's position of using conceptual means to eliminate conceptual constructions (*Bhāvaṅkārama* III), as reflected in the *Shouji* on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*. In this text, Chödrup endorses Kamalaśīla's division of meditative cultivation into two complementary methods, 'tranquillity meditation' (Skt. *śamatha*), and 'insight meditation' (Skt. *vipaśyanā*), which involve nonconceptual and conceptual constructions respectively ("The so-called state of no analytical thought refers to *śamatha*, while the so-called state of involving analytical thought refers to *vipaśyanā*" (T. 2802.85, 941a19–20: 言無分別者, 即止品也; 言有分別者, 即觀品也). Cf. Birgit Kellner, "Using Concepts to Eliminate Conceptualization:



#### 4. A Chronology

Due to the clear records in colophons of Dunhuang Chinese manuscripts, we know that Chödrup was mainly active in Shazhou and Ganzhou. From 813 (at the latest) until possibly 838, he was active in Shazhou, lecturing at Yongkang Monastery and Yongshou Monastery (P. 2794; P. 2284; P. 2328; BD6205; BD15358, etc.). From 842 (at the latest), he was active at Xiuduo Monastery, Ganzhou (S. 1287; S. 5010; P. 2073).<sup>149</sup> From at the latest 855 onwards,<sup>150</sup> he resided in Shazhou and lectured at the Kaiyuan Monastery (Royal Library of C. 12; S. 6670; BD2298; S. 735; S. 3927; Dx 1610; f 70; S. 6483; P. 4587). Moreover, Chödrup's name also appears in manuscripts produced by the prolific copying project in Dunhuang patronised by the Tibetan Empire from the 820s to the 840s, sometimes as the scribe, other times as the proofreader in the first or second round, and most frequently, as the final proofreader.<sup>151</sup>

A larger difficulty in reconstructing his biography, however, lies in establishing a chronology of his translation activities, especially his translations into Tibetan, as none of Chödrup's translations into Tibetan bears a clear date.<sup>152</sup> Nevertheless, it is still possible to narrow down the

---

Kamalaśīla on Nonconceptual Gnosis (*nirvikalpajñāna*)," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 43 (2020): 39–80, especially 61–62 on the *samādhavipaśyanā* division.

<sup>149</sup> As for the reason for his move to Ganzhou, it was possibly due to the unrest in the Tibetan Empire, which could have also affected Dunhuang. Xu Jian ("Tufan gaoseng wu facheng shengping santi," 40) connects his relocation to Ganzhou with the political upheaval during Lang Dharma's reign.

<sup>150</sup> Xu Jian ("Tufan gaoseng wu facheng shengping santi," 40) argues that Chödrup possibly returned to Dunhuang after the Guiyijun replaced the Tibetan Empire as the actual rulers of Ganzhou in the year 850 or 851. For the annals of the Guiyijun, see Rong Xinjiang, *Guiyijun shi yanjiu*, 1–43, especially 2–3. Possibly at the behest of the Guiyijun, Chödrup returned to Dunhuang from Ganzhou as Dunhuang was then the political and religious centre. Therefore, the earliest possible year for his return to Dunhuang could be 850 or 851. I write the year 855 in the main body of the text as this is the earliest attested year when Chödrup was active in Dunhuang again.

<sup>151</sup> Li, "Toward A Typology of Chödrup's Cursive Handwriting," 15–19. On the *sūtra*-copying project, see Brandon Dotson, "The Remains of the Dharma: Editing, Rejecting, and Replacing the Buddha's Words in Officially Commissioned Sūtras from Dunhuang, 820s to 840s," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 36–37 (2015): 5–68.

<sup>152</sup> Wu Qiyu argues that, since there are no Dunhuang manuscripts (as Wu assumes) bearing Chödrup's name from the years 815 to 833, Chödrup probably stayed in Central Tibet during this period for translation projects at the invitation of the Tibetan emperor. However, the hypothesis that Chödrup ever stayed in Tibet lacks concrete evidence. Even

periods of translation activity by means of Kangyur colophons and records in early Tibetan catalogues. A presumable *terminus ante quem* for his activities of translating Chinese *sūtras* into Tibetan is 848, the year when Tibetan rule ended and was replaced by the local Guiyijun rulers.<sup>153</sup> After all, as an autonomous entity newly liberated from Tibetan control through military endeavours (and in reality, also independent of the changing Chinese governments further eastward),<sup>154</sup> the Guiyijun exhibited no motivation to engage in communication with the central Tibetan Empire. Instead, they likely deliberately demarcated themselves from the Tibetan Empire. This would have posed an obstacle to circulating translations finished after 848 in Central Tibet and compiling them in Kangyurs later on. Therefore, Chödrup's Tibetan translations that were later compiled into the Kangyurs should have already been circulated in Central Tibet before 848.

Apart from that, the Tibetan imperial edicts on translating Buddhist texts (the *Mahāvvyutpatti* and *sGra sbyor* [On the Use of Words]) and the Tibetan imperial catalogues (LKK and PTK) can provide us with many useful hints. As commonly noted, Chödrup used the new terminologies (Tib. *skad gsar bcad*) that were officially enacted by three decrees (Tib. *bkas bcad*), the last of which was issued around the year 814.<sup>155</sup> Therefore, the translation, or at least the revision, of most of his translations took place at least after 814.

---

if he was ordered by the Tibetan emperors to translate texts from Chinese, he may have undertaken the projects in Dunhuang. Moreover, as Table 1 below illustrates, several manuscripts produced from Chödrup's lecture on the *Śālistambasūtra* date somewhere between 815 and 838. Cf. Wu Qiyu, "Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi hōjō denkō," 399–407.

<sup>153</sup> On the other hand, Chödrup, residing in Ganzhou at that time, may have continued the translation projects supported by the Tibetan imperial court for some time after 848, even after 850/851, the year the Guiyijun gained the control of Ganzhou. However, he had to gradually conclude these translation projects, as the Guiyijun rule had no motivation to continue such projects. After all, Tibetan and Chinese as lingua francas were well established in Dunhuang and the surrounding, and there was no need to launch new translation projects for local people.

<sup>154</sup> The discussion that local rulers of Dunhuang were independent of changing Chinese governments further eastward is perused in BuddhistRoad Team, *The Buddhist Road: Major Themes in Central Asian Buddhism I*, Leiden: Brill, forthcoming 2024/2025, ch. 1.

<sup>155</sup> Scherrer-Schaub and Bonani, "Establishing a Typology of the Old Tibetan Manuscripts," 311.



The LKK and the PTK, which are tentatively dated to ca. 812<sup>156</sup> and ca. 842,<sup>157</sup> respectively, record fifteen translations by Chödrup in total (numeration follows Sections 2.1): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15?, 22, and 23. However, these works were not necessarily all translated before the presumed compilation dates of the two imperial catalogues, as both imperial catalogues underwent much revision in transmission.<sup>158</sup> It is not inconceivable that many entries were added to the imperial catalogues at a much later time. If these highly re-edited sources cannot be directly used to determine the accurate circumstances of a translation in ninth-century Tibet, how can we effectively use these sources in historical studies? In this regard, I argue that, compared to searching for the presence of a translation in early catalogues, analysing its absence could shed a more meaningful light on Tibetan textual history.

To be specific, suppose a text was recorded neither in the LKK nor the PTK, but was indeed recorded in Kangyurs (e.g., 6, 14–21). Compared to the possibility that this text was deleted from the early catalogues by later editors, which does not make much sense, it is more likely that this text had not yet been translated by the time the later catalogue PTK was compiled (842). In other words, translations 2.1.6 and 2.1.14–21 had perhaps not yet been translated by 842. These translations (14–21) were likely translated between 842 and 848, considering the above-mentioned *terminus ante quem* of 848.

There is another situation in which a text was not recorded in the earlier LKK, but was present in the PTK (translations 2.1.8, 12, 13). This situation is easy to explain, as the translations could have been finished between the compilation dates of the LKK and PTK. To be specific, the *Great Compassion Dhāraṇī* is not recorded in the LKK, but appears in the PTK. According to Herrmann-Pfandt, as I have already discussed, this translation would have been completed between 812 (or even after 814, as

---

<sup>156</sup> Herrmann-Pfandt, *Die Lhan kar ma*, xviii–xxi.

<sup>157</sup> Among many other references, Brandon Dotson, “Emperor Mu Rug Btsan and the *Phang thang ma* Catalogue,” 4.

<sup>158</sup> It is well known that the LKK is incorporated in the Tengyurs, and was probably subject to multiple editorial revisions during the compilation and transmission of Tengyurs. The PTK must have undergone a similar procedure. Van der Kuijp even argues that the PTK “overtly shows a greater degree of later editorial revisions than the seventeenth century xylographs of the LKK.” Leonard van der Kuijp, “Some Remarks on the Meaning and Use of the Tibetan Word *bam po*,” *Zangxue xuekan* 藏学学刊 / *Journal of Tibetology* 5 (2009): 115.

it uses the new terminology) and 842. Following the same line of thought, the *Sūtra of the Ringing Staff* and the *Rites for the Practices of Holding the Ringing Staff* would have been composed in the same period, between 814 and 842.

Apart from the previous two cases, there is a more puzzling situation: a translation is absent or claimed to be unfinished in the later PTK, but already recorded in the earlier LKK. To be specific, *Avalokiteśvara's Unimpeded Wish-fulfilling Wheel* was only recorded in the LKK, but not in the PTK. It is possible that this translation was finished after the compilation of the PTK (namely, after 842), but editors of the Tengyurs added it to the LKK in later times. Moreover, although the LKK was said to have been composed earlier than the PTK, the PTK's section on the MRK actually displays a relatively higher level of archaism.<sup>159</sup> As we see, the PTK records four chapters translated by Chödrup from the MRK. One (the *Question of the Girl Vimalaśraddhā*) is recorded in the section on “*sūtras* of the length of a half *bam po*,” while three (2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.22) are listed in the section on “*sūtras* and *vinayas* whose translations are not complete” (Tib. *mdo sde dang 'dul ba'I bsgyur 'phro*). Accordingly, translation 2.1.3 would have been finished before 842, while the other three (2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.22) may have been still in the process of translation in 842. The LKK's records on them probably reflect a later editorial revision.

In sum, among Chödrup's translations that were recorded in the imperial catalogues, 2.1.3, 2.1.8, 2.1.12, and 2.1.13 may have been finalised between the 810s (around the time the last decree concerning the new language was enacted) and 842 (the completion of the PTK). 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.22 may have been still in progress in 842. The

---

<sup>159</sup> To be specific, the LKK contains a full-fledged MRK section with forty-eight *sūtra* chapters, which seems to have been influenced by the Kangyurs' forty-nine-chapter organisation. In contrast, the PTK only contains nine *sūtra* chapters in its MRK section, while most of the other *sūtra* chapters are spread throughout other sections of the PTK. The MRK section of PTK may reflect a proto-Kangyur organisation. Halkias, “A Catalogue from the Imperial Court of 'Phang Thang,” 66. See Li, Channa, “Reconstructing a Tibetan Mahāratnakūṭasūtra Collection Translated from Chinese: New Light on the Early Translation History of *Dkon Brtsegs* Based on Dunhuang Manuscripts,” in *The Canons, Kangyurs, and Collections: Multidisciplinary Approaches in the Study of Tibetan Canonical Literature*, ed. by Markus Viehbeck, Bruno Lainé, Kurt Tropper, and Verena Widorn (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, forthcoming) for a study of the early translation history of the MRK in Tibet.



*Avalokiteśvara's Unimpeded Wish-fulfilling Wheel* may not yet have been translated before 842, but was likely finished by 848.<sup>160</sup>

The rest of Chödrup's Tibetan translations are only found in Dunhuang, but not in Kangyurs, including: the *Sūtra Entitled The Teaching on the Proper and Improper Time* (IOL Tib J 213; Chap. 2.1.14); *Verse on the Treatise Entitled The Hundred Syllables* and *Exposition on the Treatise Entitled The Hundred Syllables* (IOL Tib J 588 I, II; Chap. 2.1.16–17); *Thirty Verses on Dependent Arising* and *Explanation to the Thirty Verses on Dependent Arising* (IOL Tib J 588 III, IV; IOL Tib J 619; P. T. 770; Chap. 2.1. 18–19); and *Exposé in Verse Form (on) the Set of Eight Nominal Cases (as They) Occur (in Use)* (IOL Tib J 625r; P. T. 783; Chap. 2.1.20). In these Dunhuang manuscripts, Chödrup bears the title of “chief editor, translator, [and] monk Chödrup” (Tib. *zhu chen gyi lo tsa pa ban de Chos grub*, from IOL Tib J 588) and “chief editor, teacher, translator, overseer of the Buddhist teaching,<sup>161</sup> [and] monk Chödrup”

<sup>160</sup> The textual history of the (2.1.15) *Lang kar gshegs pa rin po che'i mdo las sangs rgyas thams cad kyi gsung gi snying po'i le'u rgya cher 'grel pa* is more puzzling, as we are not sure whether it should be identified with LKK 568 and PTK 517. If they are the same text, this translation may have been finished in the 810s.

<sup>161</sup> Cristina Scherrer-Schaub, “Enacting Words: A Diplomatic Analysis of the Imperial Decrees [*Bkas bcad*] and their Application in the *Sgra sbyor ban po gñis pa* Tradition,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 25. 1–2 (2002): 263–340. She translates *bcom ldan 'das ring lugs* as “the commissioner of the Bhagavat,” who officiated at the college of translators (Tib. *dar ma bsgyur ba'i lo tsa ba'i grar*), according to the second authoritative decision recorded in the *sGra sbyor* [On the Use of Words]. *Ibid.* 315.

Michael Walter, “The Significance of the Term ‘ring lugs,’” *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 51.3 (1998): 309–319. He points out one meaning of *ringluk* (Tib. *ring lugs*) in Dunhuang historical or official documents, that is, “an abstract nominal phrase, denoting not a group of people per se, or a document, or laws, etc., but a selected set of officials who have, as a special responsibility, the particular duty of the enforcement of laws which—coming from and representing the presence (ring) of the Btsan-po—must be upheld to maintain order, social, political, and cosmic” (*ibid.*, 312). He also associates the significance of the term *bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs* with emperor's (Tib. *btsan po*) sacredness, translating it as “the custom of the continuing sacrar presence (of the Btsan po) relating to the Bhagavan” (*ibid.*, 314). Hence, *bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs* here signifies that Chödrup oversees or controls the Buddhist community on behalf of the Tibetan emperor.

From *ring's* ancient meaning as ‘the body’ and *lugs* as ‘principles, rules,’ Chen Jian argues that *ring lugs* can mean “the figure who embodies the principles” (Chin. *shenze* 身则, *shenfan* 身范), which was then generally used to designate an “officer/leader” who, for instance, settles civil cases, as mentioned in Dunhuang manuscripts (e.g., P. T. 12971, P. T. 12972, P. T. 1084, P. T. 1077). Cf. Chen Jian 陳踐, “Zangyu ring-lugs yici yanbian kao 藏語 ring-lugs 一詞演變考 [Studies on the Change of the Meanings of the Tibetan



(Tib. *zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang lo tsa ba bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs ban de Chos grub*, fr. IOL Tib J 213; with minor variation in P. T. 770; Derge 555, Derge 694, Derge 692 = Derge 898, and Derge 107), or “chief editor, teacher, translator, [and] monk Chödrup” (Tib. *zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang lo tsa ba ban de chos grub*, fr. IOL Tib J 625). Since the titles “chief editor [and] teacher” (Tib. *zhu chen gyi mkhan po*; more literally, “chief editor among teachers”) and “overseer of the Buddhist teaching” or “commissioner of the Bhagavat” (Tib. *bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs*) were closely associated with Tibetan imperial translation projects, the above texts may still have been translated under the Tibetan Empire, but close to the end of this period.

On the other hand, Chödrup’s Chinese translations usually bear a clearer hint for assigning a date. For instance, the colophon of (2.2.1) *Heart of the Perfection of Wisdom* explicitly mentions Chödrup’s affiliation with the Tibetan Empire, and therefore the translation of this text can safely be placed before the year 848. As for the *Sūtra of the Mother Dhāraṇī Among the Stars* (2.2.2), a *renxu* year (842) is recorded; *The Treatise on the Five-Categorised Substances of the Sarvāstivāda School* (2.2.3) is recorded to have been translated in a *bingyin* year (846). As for the *Verses on the Twenty Bodhisattva Precepts* (2.2.4) and *Eight Nominal Cases* (2.2.5), since they are closely associated with Chödrup’s lectures on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* and their colophons do not mention Chödrup’s official affiliation with the Tibetan imperial government, they therefore may have been translated after the year 848. The *Records on the Demise of the Semblance Dharma of Tathāgata Śākyamuni* (2.2.6), also records the same title for Chödrup, and therefore seems also to have been finished in this period.

According to manuscript BD14676 (tentatively entitled *The Distribution of Monk Wu’s Possession of Sūtras and Śāstras*), Chödrup’s

---

Term *ring-lugs*,” *Zhongguo zangxue* 中國藏學 / *China Tibetology* 3 (1991): 134–140. Wang Yao also translates this term as something close to “local officer” in P. T. 1084: for the phrase *ring lugs stag lo mang ka sa* (line 6), Wang renders it as “the local officer *sTag lo mang ka sa*” (Chin. *difang zhangguan daluomanggasa* 地方長官達洛芒噶薩). Cf. Wang Yao 王堯, “P.T.1297(2), 1096r, 1084 hao suzhuang yiwen P.T. 1297(2), 1096r, 1084 號訴狀譯文 [A Translation of the Petition Texts in P. T. 1297(2), 1096r, 1084],” in *Dunhuang Tufan wenshu yishi* 敦煌吐蕃文書譯釋 [Translations and Commentaries of Dunhuang Tibetan Manuscripts] (Beijing: Zhongguo zangxue chuban she, 2002), 112.



personal collection of books had been distributed on January 3, 865,<sup>162</sup> which implies that he must have passed away by then. Moreover, one of Chödrup's "eulogies [under the] portraits" (Chin. *miaozhen zan* 邈真讚) preserved in P. 2913 has a colophon dated to 869 (the tenth year of *xiantong* 咸通十年). It is therefore safe to say that he had passed away by 865.

Based on the foregoing discussions, in combination with information provided in the colophons of Dunhuang manuscripts, I tentatively establish a chronology of Chödrup's activities as follows:

---

<sup>162</sup> It starts with: "On January 3, 865, it was ordered that Monk Wu's possession of *sūtras* and *śāstras* must be distributed" (咸通六年 (865) 正月三日, 奉處分吳和尚經論). Cf. Ueyama, *Go oshō zōsho mokuroku*.

City	Monastery	Date	Activities/Works	Titles
Shazhuo (?) <sup>163</sup>	∅	801	copied the <i>Treatise on Transcendence of Cognition</i> by Monk Damo (P. 2885)	Monk Facheng (僧法成)
Shazhou	∅	813– 815	lectured on the <i>Śālistambasūtra</i> and the <i>Śatadharmaparakāśamukhaśāstra</i> [Lucid Introduction on the <i>Mahāyāna Sūtra</i> on the One Hundred Phenomena], which are recorded in (3.1 (3)) <i>Clarification of the Elucidation of the Śālistambasūtra</i> and <i>Lecture Notes on the Hundred Phenomena</i> , respectively (P. 2328)	∅
	Yong-shou	823	lectured on the <i>Śālistambasūtra</i> , which is recorded in (3.1 (1)) <i>Lecture Notes on the Śālistambasūtra</i> (BD6205 and P. 2912)	∅
	Yong-kang	833	lectured on the <i>Caturdharmakanāmahāyānasūtra</i> which is recorded in textual group (3.2) <i>Exegetical Notes on the Caturdharmakasūtra</i> (P. 2794)	Venerable <i>tripītakācārya</i> [and] monk of the Great Tibetan Empire
		833	lectured on the <i>Ṣaṇmukhīdhāraṇīsūtra</i> , which is recorded in textual group (3.3) <i>Exegetical Notes on the Ṣaṇmukhīdhāraṇīsūtra</i> (P. 2404)	∅
		823 or 835(?)	lectured on the <i>Śālistambasūtra</i> , which is recorded in (3.1(2)) <i>Hand Mirror of the Śālistambasūtra</i> (BD 15358)	Of the Great Tibetan Empire <sup>164</sup>

<sup>163</sup> This piece of writing was possibly finished when Chödrup was a student who studied Tankuang's teachings. Since Tankuang was based in Dunhuang in the later years of his life, Chödrup may also have been residing in Dunhuang when he copied the text in P. 2885. It is not clear whether Chödrup was Tankuang's direct disciple. According to Ueyama, Tankuang may have died in Dunhuang between 787 and 788. If there was any overlap in Tankuang and Chödrup's lifetimes, Chödrup must have been quite young when he met Tankuang.

<sup>164</sup> Colophon: 大番國沙州永康寺沙彌於。卯年十二月廿五日寫記。



Shazhou (?)	∅	838	lectured on the <i>Śālistambasūtra</i> , which is recorded in (3.1(2)) <i>Hand Mirror of the Śālistambasūtra</i> (Dx 302)	∅
Shazhou	∅	820s–840s	participated in the prolific <i>sūtra</i> -copying project (Db T. 444, Db T. 487, Db. T. 1125, Db T. 2932, etc.)	as the scribe and proofreader
∅	∅	ca. 814–842	translated 2.1.3, 2.1.8, 2.1.12, 2.1.13 from Chinese into Tibetan	chief editor, teacher, translator, [and] monk <sup>165</sup>
∅	∅	842–848	translated 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.6, 2.1.9, 2.1.22 from Chinese into Tibetan	chief editor, translator, [and] monk Chödrup <sup>166</sup>
∅	∅	shortly before 848	translated 2.1.14, 2.1.16, 2.1.17, 2.1.18, 2.1.19, 2.1.20 from Chinese into Tibetan	chief editor, teacher, translator, overseer of the Buddhist teachings, [and] monk Chödrup <sup>167</sup>
∅	∅	?–848	translated 2.1.4, 2.1.5, 2.1.7, 2.1.10, 2.1.11, 2.1.23 from Chinese into Tibetan; composed 7.2 and 7.3	∅
Ganzhou	Xiuduo	842	translated the (2.2.2) <i>Grahamātrkā-dhāraṇī</i> into Chinese (S. 5010, BD2315, Shanghai Library 121)	monk Facheng <sup>168</sup>
		846	translated the (2.2.3) <i>Pañcavastuka</i> into Chinese: P. 2073, P. 2116	of the Great Tibetan Empire <sup>169</sup>

<sup>165</sup> Derge 555 colophon: *zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang lo tstsha ba bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs pa bande chos grub*. Cf also Derge 691 colophon: *zhu chen gyi lo tstsha ba bande chos grub*; Derge 108 colophon: *lotstsha ba dge slong 'gos chos grub*.

<sup>166</sup> Colophons of Derge 354, Stog. 266, IOL Tib J 205: *zhu chen gyi lo tstsha ba ban de chos grub*. Other colophons: *lo tstsha ba mgos [or 'gos] chos grub* (Stog 11.07; Stog. 11.13); *Zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang lo tstsha ba bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs pa bande chos grub* (Derge 692); etc.

<sup>167</sup> Colophons of IOL Tib J 213; P. T. 770: *zhu chen gyi mkhan po [dang] lo tsa ba bcom ldan 'das kyi ring lugs ban de chos grub*. Other colophons: *zhu chen gyi lo tsa pa ban de chos grub* (IOL Tib J 588).

<sup>168</sup> The three manuscript colophons all read: 壬戌年四月十六日於甘州修多寺翻譯此經. The title monk Facheng (Chin. *shamen facheng* 沙門法成) is attested in P. 3916, S. 2827, etc. In one copy of this text (P. 4587), there was a note added by Yang Yingde (fl. 9th c., 陽英德) in the year 857.

<sup>169</sup> Colophon: 丙寅年五月十五日於大蕃甘州張掖縣譯.

Ø	Ø	after 848	translated the (2.2.4) <i>Verses on the Twenty Bodhisattva Precepts</i> , (2.2.5) <i>Eight Nominal Cases</i> , and (2.2.6) <i>Records on the Demise of the Semblance Dharma of Tathāgata Śākyamuni</i> into Chinese	Venerable <i>tripiṭakācārya</i> [and] monk Chödrup of the state
Shazhou	Kaiyuan	855–859 <sup>170</sup>	lectured on textual group (3.5) <i>Yogācārabhūmiśāstra</i> : P. 2038, Royal Library of Copenhagen 12; S. 735, 3927, 5309, 6670, 6483, BD14032, etc.	Venerable <i>tripiṭakācārya</i> [and] monk Chödrup of the state <sup>171</sup>

<sup>170</sup> The manuscript with the earliest date hitherto identified is Royal Library of Copenhagen 12 (855). The manuscript with the latest date is S. 6483, the fifty-fifth and fifty-sixth fascicles of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, written down by Mingzhao in 859 (大中十三年 859 歲次己卯四月二十四日 比丘照明隨聽寫記). Cf. Rong Xinjiang and Yu Xin, *Dunhuang xieben bianwei shili*.

<sup>171</sup> S. 3927: 國大德三藏法師沙門. Cf also S. 5309. In P. 2038 and P. 2039, two manuscripts possessed by Tanxun and Fuhui, almost every volume contains a separate colophon. Most colophons state: “It was preached by Chödrup, the great, venerable *tripiṭakācārya* of the Empire” (國大德三藏法師法成述). Only in one volume of P. 2038 does it state: “It was preached by the district overseer of the great Tibetan Empire [and] *tripiṭakācārya* Chödrup” (大番國都統三藏法師述). I suspect the latter title of Chödrup was written by the copyists who unwittingly used the outdated form of his title.

Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 109, argues that, here, the Chinese title district overseer or controller officer (Chin. *dutong* 都統) is a Chinese translation of the Tibetan title *ringluk* (Tib. *ring lugs*), which frequently appears in the colophons of Chödrup’s Tibetan translations. See fn. 161 above.

It should be noted that in the Tibetan-ruled Dunhuang, the name of the highest-ranked officer was changed to ‘district transmitter of the Buddhist teaching’ (Chin. *du jiaoshou* 都教授, Tib. *mkhan po*) in place of ‘district [*saṃgha*] overseer’ (Chin. *du [seng]tong* 都[僧]统, Tib. *ring lugs*) from around 820. Cf. Chikusa Masaaki 竺沙雅章, “Tonkō no sōkan seido 敦煌の僧官制度 [Bureaucratic System Concerning Buddhist Officials in Dunhuang],” in *Chūgoku bukkyō shakaishi kenkyū* 中國佛教社會史研究 [Studies on the Social History of Buddhism in China], 371. For instance, the monk Hongbian was addressed as ‘district transmitter of the Buddhist teaching’ in Tibetan. That is to say, the appearance of the term district overseer in Chödrup’s Chinese title is probably just a translation of Tibetan *ringluk* from Chödrup’s formulaic Tibetan title *bcom ldan ’das kyi ring lugs*, and does not imply that Chödrup once served as the highest monastic officer in Dunhuang. For a discussion of Hongbian’s title of *khenpo*, cf. Cuilan Liu, “Buddhist Litigants in Public Court: A Case Study of Legal Practices in Tibetan-Ruled Dunhuang (786–848),” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 139.1 (2019): 103; Tsuguhito Takeuchi, *Old Tibetan Contracts from Central Asia* (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan, 1995), 236–237.

However, the *khenpo* in Chödrup’s formulaic title (i.e., *zhu chen gyi mkhan po dang lo tsa ba*) should not be understood in this way. In view of the other elements (*zhu chen*, *lo tsta ba*) that refer to his intellectual roles, *khenpo* here should simply be understood as the honorific appellation for teacher or preceptor.



	Ø	before 865	died, as inferred from BD14676 <i>The Distribution of Monk Wu's Possession of Sūtras and Śāstras</i> and his eulogies (P. 2913)	Monk Wu; state preceptor
--	---	------------	---	--------------------------

Table 1. A working chronology of Chödrup's monastic activities

### 6. Conclusion

This paper is a general reinvestigation of Chödrup's monastic activities, not only based on a wide-ranging survey of primary sources in Dunhuang, but also drawing heavily from previous scholarly works, especially those written in Japanese and Chinese. It aims to provide a clearer historical context for Chödrup's works, including his translations, compositions, and lectures, as he resided, travelled, and lectured in Dunhuang and its neighbouring areas.

Chödrup was, first and foremost, a great Buddhist translator. This paper therefore starts with an overview of the twenty-three Tibetan translations attributed to him. I trace how different historically transmitted sources (including the LKK, PTK TGGNO, BC, and different Kangyur versions) record these translations, and examine whether these transmitted records are consistent and compatible with the findings from Dunhuang. Such a comparison not only helps us examine the authenticity and accuracy of these historical records, but also sheds light on a possibly overlooked aspect of the transmission of the Tibetan canon. Although not all records in Kangyurs have been attested in Dunhuang manuscripts—as the Dunhuang manuscripts, which are fragmentary and incomplete in nature, only provide us with a partial vision of this history—most Kangyur records of Chödrup's translatorship are supported, directly or indirectly, by Dunhuang manuscripts (i.e., the translations numbered 2.1.4, 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.1.11, 2.1.12, 2.1.13, etc.). On the other hand, through examining records of Chödrup's translatorship in various Kangyurs, we see that the Tempangma lineage of Kangyur seems to be more open to translations from Chinese than the Tselpa lineage, as the former contains one more of Chödrup's translation from Chinese (i.e., 2.1.21) and also preserves more records of his translatorship. For instance, in the cases of translations 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.3, Chödrup's translatorship is confirmed solely in Kangyurs of the Tempangma lineage, not in earlier imperial catalogues

*BuddhistRoad Paper 1.3.* Li, "Toward a History of Chödrup's Monastic Activities"

(despite their being heavily re-edited) or Kangyurs of the Tselpa lineage. It is thus worthwhile to question whether there existed a hitherto unrecognised source of knowledge obtained by the editors of the Tempangma Kangyur lineage.

There are six Chinese texts known so far to have been translated by Chödrup. Preliminary research reveals that Chödrup translated these from Tibetan and Sanskrit. The *Heart of the Perfection of Wisdom* (2.2.1) and *Records on the Demise of the Semblance Dharma of Tathāgata Śākyamuni* (2.2.6) may have been rendered from Tibetan. Chödrup may have been motivated to translate these by the fact that their Tibetan versions had no Chinese parallels. Another possible impetus for Chödrup's Chinese translation project is that he may have obtained Sanskrit versions that had not yet been translated into Chinese. The *Sūtra of the Mother Dhāraṇī Among the Stars* (2.2.2) and *Treatise on the Five-Categorised Substances of the Sarvāstivāda School* (2.2.3) may have been translated under such circumstances. In addition, Chödrup's lectures on the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* were another important motive for his Chinese translations. The *Verses on the Twenty Bodhisattva Precepts* (2.2.4) and *Eight Nominal Cases* (2.2.5) were closely associated with Chödrup's *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* lectures. Scholars have previously only acknowledged Chödrup's mastery of Chinese and Tibetan, but his command of Sanskrit should also not be underrated.

In addition, discrepancies among the records in the transmitted sources can help us to work out a rough date for Chödrup's Tibetan translations, as I have attempted to do in section 4. I recapitulate my criteria here, which admittedly run the risk of oversimplifying what was certainly a much more complex process. Considering that Tibetan translation projects were mostly patronised by the Tibetan imperial court, and that the Tibetan translations would have been finished and transported to Tibet so as to be accessible there and later collected in Kangyurs, the translations collected in Kangyurs may have been finished and have arrived in Tibet before 848, the year when the Tibetan regime of Dunhuang was replaced by the local Guiyijun rule. As for Chödrup's Tibetan translations that are not found in Kangyurs, they may have been finished shortly before 848, leaving insufficient time for them to be transmitted to Central Tibet. Furthermore, some dates can be narrowed down even further by comparing the different records of the LKK and PTK. Since both the LKK and PTK were heavily re-edited in the following centuries, it is questionable whether the entries



they contain were originally there or were added at a much later time. In comparison, what is omitted from these catalogues can shed light on a more reliable history. If a translation was recorded in the PTK but not in the LKK, it seems that it must have been finished between the dates of compilation of the two catalogues (namely, 814–842). If a translation is absent from both the LKK and PTK, it may have been finished after the PTK’s presumed date of compilation (842). If a translation is only found in the LKK but not in the PTK, it may likewise have been composed after the PTK’s presumed date of compilation, and the record in the LKK should be understood as a later addition. Establishing the chronology of such a figure as Chödrup, even quite tentatively, can facilitate a broader political and intellectual view of ninth-century Eastern Central Asia.

Moreover, Chödrup was a key figure in the confluence and synthesis of the two mainstream Buddhist traditions that were circulating in contemporary India and China: on the one hand, Chödrup was quite familiar with the teachings of Kamalaśīla and other Indian masters (such as Jñānadatta), and followed the Yogācāra-Madhyamaka tradition in his lectures on the *Śālistamba* and *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*; on the other hand, he can also be placed in the Ximing lineage of the Chinese Yogācāra tradition founded by Xuanzang, and was heavily influenced by Tankuang’s works. In other words, as a scholar of the Yogācāra tradition, Chödrup’s teachings can be traced back to Vasubandhu’s works through two different lineages, one being the Xuanzang-Wonch’uk-Tankuang lineage, the other that of Kamalaśīla and other intermediate Indian masters (such as Jñānadatta). More interestingly, in the case of Chödrup’s teachings, the Indian side, represented by Kamalaśīla, and the Chinese Chan side were not rivals, as stereotypically portrayed in the famous Samyé narrative. In sum, combining the teachings of both sides, Chödrup’s works reflect a rich synthesis of diverse Buddhist traditions that were transmitted in India, Eastern Central Asian including Central Tibet, and China.

### *7. Supplement: Chödrup’s Three Compositions*

There are three further Dunhuang manuscripts with texts possibly composed by Chödrup. I list them separately here, as they do not easily fit in the above categories of translations or commentaries.



7.1 *Tan zhufu rulai wuranzhuode zan* 歎諸佛如來無染著德讚  
[Eulogy Exclaimed to Buddhas and Tathāgathas for Their Virtue of  
Nonattachment] (P. 2886)

According to the colophon, “it was orally preached by the great, venerable *tripiṭakācārya* [and] monk Chödrup of the empire” (Chin. *guo dade sanzang fashi shamen facheng shu* 國大德三藏法師沙門法成述). As previously noted (2.2.6), it is plausible that this unique title was employed in the period after the end of the Tibetan rule in Dunhuang. This *stotra* (“eulogy”) increase from three-word sentences (Skt. *pāda*), to four-word, to five-word, and finally to seven-word sentences. It is not certain whether this work is a translation or Chödrup’s own composition. In the same manuscript (P. 2886), another short work, *Jixiangtongzi shoucao ji* 吉祥童子授草偈 [Verses on the Grass Offered by the Boy Svastika] is also written, which is also found in manuscripts of Chödrup’s *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* lectures.

### 7.2 IOL Tib J 686

This text is a story about Maudgalyāyana saving his mother from hell. This untitled text is summarised from the Dunhuang Chinese transformation text (Chin. *bianwen* 變文) *Da Muqianlian mingjian jiumu* 大目乾連冥間救母 [Mahāmaudgalyāyana Saving His Mother from Hell] (preserved in P. 2319).<sup>172</sup> Chödrup’s authorship is verified by the manuscript colophon: *dge slong chos grub kyis bgyis* (“It was composed by the monk Chödrup”). An excellent study including a complete transcription and a full English translation has been provided by Kapstein.<sup>173</sup>

### 7.3 IOL Tib J 687

This is a text about the fruits of obeying or disobeying the eight precepts for lay Buddhist followers (Chin. *baguan zhajie* 八關齋戒, Tib. *bslab*

---

<sup>172</sup> An English translation of this famous Chinese transformation text can be found in Victor Mair, *Tun-Huang Popular Narratives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 87–122. Cf. Matthew Kapstein, “A Dunhuang Tibetan Summary of the Transformation Text on Mulian Saving His Mother from Hell,” in *Dunhuang wenxian lunji* 敦煌文獻論集 [Collected Papers on Dunhuang Documents], ed. Hao Chunwen 郝春文 (Shenyang: Liaoning Renmin chubanshe, 2001), 235–247.

<sup>173</sup> Kapstein, “A Dunhuang Tibetan Summary of the Transformation Text on Mulian Saving His Mother from Hell.”



*pa'i gzhi brgyad*). According to Ueyama, only the last four of the eight are preserved: those (1) against false speech; (2) against alcohol, dancing, singing, and using perfumes; (3) against sleeping on high beds; and (4) against untimely eating.<sup>174</sup> The manuscript colophon identifies Chodrup as the author: *dge slong chos grub kyis mdo sde dang/ 'dul ba dang/ bstan bcos rnams las btus te bgyis so* (“Monk Chödrup collected [passages] from *sūtras*, *vinayas*, and treatises, and composed the texts”). Ren offers a full transcription and a Chinese translation.<sup>175</sup>

---

<sup>174</sup> Ueyama, *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū*, 159ff.

<sup>175</sup> Ren, *Zangyi Shan 'e yinguojing duikan yu yanjiu*, 5–12.

*Abbreviations*

- BC *Chos 'byung* [History of the Teaching] of Butön, textual number follows Nishioka Soshū 西岡祖秀, “‘*Putun Bukkyō-shi' Mokurokubu Sakuin* I-III 「ブトウン仏教史」目録部索引 I-III [Index to the Catalogue Section of Bu ston's History of Buddhism]”, *Tōkyō Daigaku bungakubu bunka kōryū kenkyū shisetsu kenkyū kiyō* 東京大學文學部文化交流研究施設研究紀要 [Research Summary of the Cultural Exchange Research Institute, Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo] 4 (1980): 61–92; 5 (1981): 43–94; 6 (1983): 47–201.
- BD Collection of Dunhuang Manuscripts preserved in the National Library of China, Beijing.
- BDRC Buddhist Digital Resource Center, <https://www.tbrc.org/>
- Beida Collection of Dunhuang Manuscripts preserved in Beijing University (Beijing daxue 北京大學).
- Derge Kangyur and Tengyur, Derge edition.
- Db. T. *Gansu cang Dunhuang zangwen wenxian* 甘肅藏敦煌藏文文獻 [Dunhuang Tibetan Manuscripts Preserved in Gansu], 30 vols, edited by Ma De 馬德 and Kancuoji 勘措吉. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2019.
- Dx Dunhuang Manuscripts preserved at the Institute of Oriental Studies, St. Petersburg, Russia. Published in the *Eluosi kexueyuan dongfang yanjiusuo shengbidebao fensuo cang Dunhuang wenxian* 俄羅斯科學院東方研究所聖彼得堡分所藏敦煌文獻 [Dunhuang Manuscripts Preserved at the St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Russia], edited by Lev Menshikov and Qian Bocheng 錢伯城. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji. 1992.



- f Chinese Manuscripts in the Kharakhoto Collection of Koslov in in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts at the Russian Academy of Science (IOM RAS).
- IOL Tib J Tibetan Dunhuang Manuscripts preserved at the British Library in London (formerly in the India Office Library (IOL)).
- LKK *dKar chag lHan kar ma* [Catalogue from the Court of lHan kar ma], edited by A. Herrmann-Pfandt. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2008.
- MRK *Mahāratnakūṭa*.
- P. Pelliot Collection of Chinese Dunhuang Manuscripts preserved at the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris.
- P. T. Pelliot Collection of Tibetan Dunhuang Manuscripts preserved at the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris.
- PTK *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma* [Catalogue from the Court of 'Phang thang ma], edited by Kawagoe Eishin 川越英真. Sendai: Tōhoku Indo-Chibetto Kenkyūkai, 2005.
- Pukdrak  
Royal Library  
of Copenhagen Kangyur, Pukdrak edition
- Dunhuang Manuscripts in the Collection of the Royal Library in Copenhagen.
- S. Stein Collection of Chinese Dunhuang Manuscripts preserved at the British Library in London.
- Stog Tibetan Kangyur Manuscript of the Stog Palace Collection.
- Shanghai Library Collection of Dunhuang Manuscripts preserved at the Shanghai Library.
- SHT *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Vol. 1–3, edited by Ernst Waldschmidt et al. (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1965), 1968, 1971; Vol. IV–V, edited by Lore Sander and Ernst Waldschmidt (Wiesbaden, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1980, 1985); Vol. 6–12, edited by Klaus Wille (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1989, 1995, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2017).

- T. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經 [Taishō Tripiṭaka], edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高順次郎 et. al. Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, 1924–1935.
- TGGNO *The Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od* [The Light Ornament of the Comprehensive Teaching] by Chomden Raldri (Tib. Bcom ldan ral gri, 1227–1305). Kurtis Schaeffer and Leonard van der Kuijp. *An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od of Bcom ldan ral gri*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 2009.

### Bibliography

#### Resources

- Beijing daxue tushuguan cang Dunhuang wenxian 2* 北京大學圖書館藏敦煌文獻 2/*Dunhuang Manuscripts Collected in Peking University Library 2*. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1995.
- Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-Huang in the India Office Library*, edited by Louis de La Vallée Poussin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Dunhuang beiming zan jishi* 敦煌碑銘贊輯釋 [An Annotated Compilation of Eulogy Texts in Dunhuang], edited by Zheng Binglin 鄭炳林. Lanzhou: Gansu jiaoyu chubanshe, 1992.
- Eluosi kexueyuan dongfang yanjiusuo shengbidebao fensuo cang Dunhuang wenxian* 俄羅斯科學院東方研究所聖彼得堡分所藏敦煌文獻 [Dunhuang Manuscripts Preserved at the St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Russia]. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1992.
- Gansu cang Dunhuang zangwen wenxian* 甘肅藏敦煌藏文文獻 [Dunhuang Tibetan Manuscripts Preserved in Gansu], 30 vols, edited by Ma De 馬德 and Kancuoji 勘措吉. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2019.
- Gansu cang Dunhuang zangwen wenxian xulu* 甘肅藏敦煌藏文文獻敘錄 [A Catalogue of Dunhuang Tibetan Manuscripts Preserved in Gansu], edited by Ma De 馬德. Lanzhou: Gansu minzu chubanshe, 2009.
- Guojia tushuguan cang Dunhuang yishu* 國家圖書館藏敦煌遺書 [Dunhuang Manuscripts Preserved at the Beijing National Library], 146 vols, edited by Ren Jigu 任繼愈, Fang Guangchang 方廣錕, et al. Beijing: Peking Library Publishing, 2005–2012.
- Inventaire des manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale*, 3 vols, edited by Marcelle Lalou. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1939–1961.
- dKar chag 'Phang thang ma* [Catalogue from the Court of 'Phang thang ma], edited by Kawagoe Eishin 川越英真. Sendai: Tōhoku Indo-Chibetto Kenkyūkai, 2005.
- Old Tibetan Contracts from Central Asia*, edited by Takeuchi Tsuguhito. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan, 1995.



“Ribben jushi dunhuang jianglai zangjing mulu 日本橋氏敦煌將來藏經目錄 [Catalogue of Dunhuang Manuscripts Taken by Tachibana Zuichō to Japan],” comp. Tachibana Zuichō 橋瑞超. In *Congshu Jicheng Xubian di'er ce* 叢書集成續編第二冊 [Extended Collectanea of Chinese Books, Vol. II]. Taipei: Xinwenfeng 1989.

*Shanghai tushuguan cang Dunhuang tulufan wenxian* 上海圖書館藏敦煌吐魯番文獻 [Dunhuang and Turfan Manuscripts Preserved in Shanghai Library], 4 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1999.

*Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經 [Taishō Canon], edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, et al. Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, 1924–1935.

### Primary Sources

*Ba zhuan shengsong* 八轉聲頌 [Verses on the Application of the Eight Nominal Cases]. P. 3950, etc.

*Banre boluomiduo xinjing* 般若波羅蜜多心經 [Heart of the Perfection of Wisdom]. P. 4882, etc.

*Bu mo nram dag dad bas zhup pa zhes bya ba* [Question of the Girl Vimalasraddhā]. Derge 84.

*Byang chub sems dpa' spyang ras gzigs dbang phyug phyag stong spyang 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* [Dhāraṇī Entitled the Complete Perfection of the Broad Mind of the Unimpeded Great Compassion of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara with a Thousand Hands and a Thousand Eyes]. Derge 691 = 897.

*Da Muqianlian mingjian jiumu* 大目乾連冥間救母 [Mahāmaudgalyāyana Saving His Mother from Hell]. P. 2319, etc.

*Dasheng baifa mingmen lun kaizong yijue* 大乘百法明門論開宗義決 [Resolving [How to] Clarify the Tenets of the \*Mahāyānaśatadharmaprakāśamukhaśāstra]. T. 2812.85.

*Dasheng daogan jing suiting shu* 大乘稻芊經隨聽疏 [Lecture Notes on the Śālistambasūtra]. P. 2284, 2303, 2583, etc.

*Dasheng daogan jing suiting shoujingji* 大乘稻芊經隨聽手鏡記 [The Hand Mirror of the Śālistambasūtra]. P. 2303r, 2569, P. T. 113V, etc.

*Dasheng daogan jing suiting shujue* 大乘稻芊經隨聽疏決 [Exegesis on the Lecture Notes on the Śālistambasūtra]. P. 2328, etc.

*Dasheng sifa jing lun ji guangshi kaijue ji* 大乘四法經論及廣釋開決記 [Exegetical Notes on the Caturdharmakanāmahāyānasūtra, the Commentary, and the Subcommentary]. P. 2794, 3007, BD 3530, etc.

*Datang Dunhuang yijing sanzang Wu heshang miaozhenzan* 大唐燉煌譯經三藏吳和尚遯真讚 [Eulogy of Monk Wu, Translator and Tripiṭakācārya at Dunhuang in the Great Tang Dynasty]. P. 2913.

*Datang Shazhou yijing sanzang dade Wu heshang miaozhenzan* 大唐沙州譯經三藏大德吳和尚貌真讚 [The Eulogy of Monk Wu, Translator and Tripiṭakācārya at Shazhou in the Great Tang Dynasty]. P. 4660.

*Dus dang dus ma yin pa bstan pa zhes bya ba'i mdo* [The Sūtra Entitled the Teaching on the Proper and Improper Time]. IOL Tib J 213.

*mDzangs* (or *'Dzangs*) *blun gyi mdo* [Sūtra of the Wise and Foolish]. Derge 341.



- \**Fengchufen Wu heshang jinglun* 奉處分吳和尚經論 [The Distribution of Monk Wu's Possession of Sūtras and Śāstras]. BD14676.
- dGa' bo mngal na gnas pa bstan pa* [The Teaching to Nanda on the Abiding in the Womb]. Derge 57.
- Go cha'i bkod pa bstan pa* [The Teaching on the Armor's Array]. Derge 51.
- dGongs pa zab mo nyes par 'grel pa'i mdo'i rgya cher 'grel pa* [Extensive Commentary on the Sūtra of Elucidating the Profound Intention]. Derge 4016.
- Gu Wu heshang mianzanwen* 故吳和尚遜讚文 [Text in Praise of the Old Master Wu]. P. 4640.
- Jixiangtongzi shoucao ji* 吉祥童子授草偈 [Verses on the Grass Offered by the Boy Named Svastika]. P. 2886.
- Jueguan lun* 絕觀論 [Treatise on Transcendence of Cognition]. P. 2885.
- 'Jug pa'i sgra brgyad bstan pa tshig le'ur byas pa* [Exposé in Verse Form (on) the Set of Eight Nominal Cases (as They) Occur (in Use)]. IOL Tib J 625r, P. T. 783.
- Khar sil gyi mdo* and *Khar sil 'chang pa'i kun tu spyod pa'i cho ga* [The Sūtra of the Ringing Staff; Rites for the Practices of Holding the Ringing Staff]. Derge 335 and 336.
- Lang kar gshegs pa rin po che'i mdo las sangs rgyas thams cad kyi gsung gi snying po'i le'u* [Chapter on the Quintessence of the Speech of All Buddhas, from the Sūtra of the Precious Laṅkāvatāra]. Derge 108.
- Lang kar gshegs pa rin po che'i mdo las sangs rgyas thams cad kyi gsung gi snying po'i le'u rgya cher 'grel pa* [Extensive Commentary on the Chapter of the Quintessence of the Speech of All Buddhas, from the Sūtra of the Greatly Precious Laṅkāvatāra]. IOL Tib J 219.
- Legs nyes kyi rgyu dang 'bras bu bstan pa* [Teaching on the Cause and Effect of the Wholesome and Unwholesome]. Derge 354.
- Liumen tuoluoni jing lun bing guangshi kaijueji* 六門陀羅經論并廣釋開決記 [Exegetical Notes on the Śaṅmukhīdhāraṇīsūtra, the Commentary, and the Subcommentary]. P. 2165, P. 2861, etc.
- kLong chen Chos 'byung* [History of the Teaching as told by Longchenpa] (Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe raying dpe skrun khang. 1991), 380.
- 'Phags pa chos bzhi pa'i rnam par bshad pa* [Exposition on the Noble Sūtra of the Four Teachings]. Derge 3990.
- 'Phags pa chos bzhi pa'i rgya cher bshad pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa* [Extensive Commentary on the Detailed Exposition on the Noble Sūtra of the Four Teachings]. Peking 5491.
- 'Phags pa lang kar gshegs pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo* [The Mahāyāna Sūtra Entitled the Laṅkāvatāra]. Derge 107.
- 'Phags pa sgo drug pa'i gzungs kyi rnam par bshad pa* [Explanation of the Noble Dhāraṇī of the Six Entrances] (Skt. *Śaṅmukhīdhāraṇīvyākhyāna*). Derge 3989.
- 'Phags pa sā lu ljang pa rgya cher 'grel pa* [Extensive Commentary on the Noble Sūtra of the Śālistambasūtra] (Skt. *Śālistambakāṭikā*). Derge 4001.
- Pusa lüiy erhsisong* 菩薩律儀二十頌 [Verses on the Twenty Bodhisattva Precepts] (Skt. *Bodhisattvasaṃvaravimśaka*). P. 3950.
- Sapoduo zong wushi lun* 薩婆多宗五事論 [Treatise on the Five-Categorised Substances of the Sarvāstivāda School] (Skt. *Pañcavastuka*). P. 2073 and 2116.
- gSer 'od dam pa mchog tu rnam par rgyal pa mdo sde rgyal po* [The King of Sūtras, the Supremely Victorious, Excellent Golden Light]. Derge 555.
- Shijia mouni rulai xiangfa miejin zhi ji* 釋迦牟尼如來像法滅盡之記 [Records on the Demise of the Semblance Dharma of Tathāgata Śākyamuni]. P. 2139.



- lTa ba'i khyad par* [Distinction of Views]. Derge 4360.
- Tan zhufo rulai wuranzhuode zan* 歎諸佛如來無染著德讚 [Praise Exclaimed to the Buddhas'/Tathāgathas' Virtue of Nonattachment]. P. 2886.
- rTen cing 'brel par 'byung ba tshig le'ur byas pa sum cu pa* [Thirty Verses on Dependent Arising] and *rTen cing 'brel par 'byung ba tshig le'ur byas pa sum cu pa 'i rnam par bshad pa* [Explanation to the Thirty Verses on Dependent Arising]. IOL Tib J 588 III, IV; IOL Tib J 619; P. T. 770.
- Tshe dang ldan pa dga' bo la mngal du 'jug pa bstan pa* [The Teaching to Nanda on Entering the Womb], Derge 58.
- Yi ge brgya pa zhes bya ba'i rab tu byed pa tshig le'ur byas pa* [Verse on the Treatise Entitled 'The Hundred Syllables'] and *Yi ge brgya pa'i rab tu byed pa rnam par bshad pa* [Exposition on the Treatise Entitled 'The Hundred Syllables']. IOL Tib J 588 I, II.
- Yinyuan xin shilun kaijue ji* 因緣心論釋開決記 [Exegetical Notes on the (Auto-)commentary to the Treatise on the Heart of Causation]. P. 2211, 2538, S. 269.
- Yogācārahūmiśāstra*. E.g., S. 3927 and S. 5309, etc.; its *Shouji* 手記 [(Handwritten) Lecture Notes]. S. 6670, S. 4011, and S. 1243, P. 2061, P. 2134, P. 3716, and BD2298; and its *Fenmen ji* 分門記 [Notes on the Categorized Preaching]. S. 2552, P. 2038, P. 2039, and P. 2122, etc.
- Yongs su skyobs pa'i snod ces bya ba'i mdo* [Sūtra Entitled the Vessel of Complete Protection]. Stog 266, Ulan Bator 314, Tokyo 266.
- Zhal bcu gcig pa'i rig sngags kyi snying po zhes bya ba'i gzungs* [Dhāraṇī Entitled the Quintessence of the Spell of the Eleven-faced Avalokiteśvara]. Derge 694.
- Zhu xingmu tuoluoni jing* 諸星母陀羅尼經 [Sūtra of the Mother Dhāraṇī Among the Stars] (Skt. *Grahamātrkādhāraṇī*). E.g., S. 5010, P. 3548, P. 4587, BD1164, BD1235, BD1842, BD1957, BD2315, BD2705, BD2750, BD2755, etc.

### Secondary Sources

- Apple, James. "A Late Old Tibetan Version of the *Heart Sūtra* Preserved in Dunhuang IOL Tib J 751." *The Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhismology at Soka University* 27 (2023): 117–133.
- BuddhistRoad Team. *The Buddhist Road: Major Themes in Central Asian Buddhism I*. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming 2024/2025.
- Chen Jian 陳踐. "Zangyu ring-lugs yici yanbian kao 藏語 ring-lugs 一詞演變考 [Studies on the Semantic Change of the Tibetan Term ring-lugs]." *Zhongguo zangxue* 中國藏學/China Tibetology 3 (1991): 134–140.
- Clarke, Shayne. "The 'Dul bar byed pa (Vinītaka) Case-Law Section of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Uttaragrantha." *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 20 (2016): 52–53.
- Chikusa Masaaki 竺沙雅章. "Tonkō no sōkan seido 敦煌の僧官制度 [Bureaucratic System Concerning Buddhist Officials in Dunhuang]." In *Chūgoku bukkyō shakaishi kenkyū* 中國佛教社會史研究 [Studies on the Social History of Buddhism in China]. 329–425. Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1982.
- Conze, Edward. "The Prājñāpāramitā-hṛdya Sūtra." In *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies: Selected Essays by Edward Conze*, 149–150. Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1967.
- Dalton, Jacob P. "Bridging Yoga and Mahāyoga: Samaya in Early Tantric Buddhism." In *Buddhism in Central Asia II—Practices and Rituals, Visual and Material*





- Transfer*, edited by Yukiyo Kasai and Henrik H. Sørensen, 270–287. Leiden: Brill, 2022.
- Doney, Lewis. “On the Margins: Between Beliefs and Doctrines within Tibetan-Ruled Dunhuang Scribal Culture.” *BuddhistRoad Paper* 1.6 (2023).
- Dotson, Brandon. “Emperor Mu Rug Btsan and the ‘Phang thang ma Catalogue.’” *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 3 (2007):1–25.
- Dotson, Brandon. “The Remains of the Dharma: Editing, Rejecting, and Replacing the Buddha’s Words in Officially Commissioned Sūtras from Dunhuang, 820s to 840s.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 36–37 (2015): 5–68.
- Emmerick, Ronald Eric. *Tibetan Texts Concerning Khotan*. London: Oxford University, 1967.
- Fukui Fumimasa 福井文雅. “Hannya shingyō to Tashingyō 般若心經と多心經 [The *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya* and the *Duoxin jing*].” *Shūkyō kenkyū* 宗教研究 [Religious Studies] 206 (1971): 152–153.
- Gyaltsen Namdol. *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdaya and Āryadharmadhātugarbhavivarāṇa of Ācārya Nāgārjuna*. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1997.
- Goodman, Amanda. “The Vajragarbhā Bodhisattva Three-Syllable Visualisation: A Chinese Buddhist Sādhana Text from Tenth Century Dunhuang.” *BuddhistRoad Paper* 2.7 (2022).
- Gokhale, Vasudev. *Pratītyasamutpādaśāstra des Ullaṅgha: kritisch behandelt und aus dem Chinesischen ins Deutsche übertragen*. PhD diss., University of Bonn, 1930.
- Gokhale, Vasudev. “Encore: The *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdaya-kārikā* of Nāgārjuna.” In *Principal V. S. Apte Commemoration Volume*, edited by Mohan Govind Dhadphale, 62–68. Pune: Deccan Education Society, 1978.
- Guerra-Glarner, Monika. “Le commentaire de Tankuang sur l’Eveil à la Foi dans le Grand Véhicule: la probable influence de Wonhyo,” *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 71.1 (2017): 187–210
- Grohmann, Friedrich F. 高明道. “Qiantan *kaijue* 淺談「開決」 [A Preliminary Discussion on *Kaijue*].” *Dharma Light Monthly* (2017): 1–6
- Halkias, Georgios. “Tibetan Buddhism Registered: A Catalogue from the Imperial Court of ’Phang Thang.” *The Eastern Buddhist* 36.1–2 (2004): 46–105.
- Haneda Tōru and Paul Pelliot. *Manuscrits de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris, Série in-folio I–IV*. Kyoto: Tōa kōkyūkai, 1926.
- Haneda Tōru and Paul Pelliot. *Manuscrits de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris, Série in-octavo I–IX*. Kyoto: Tōa kōkyūkai, 1926.
- Howard (Masang), Meghan. “Translation at the Crossroads: The Career of Wu Facheng 吳法成 / Go Chödrup འགོ་ཚལ་གྲུབ་ Set in Context.” PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2023.
- Howard Masang, Meghan. “Sino-Tibetan Scholasticism: Case Study of the Sino-Tibetan Scholasticism: A Case Study of the *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdaya* in Dunhuang.” In *Buddhism in Central Asia III—Impacts of Non-Buddhist Influences, Doctrines*, edited by Lewis Doney, Carmen Meinert, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Yukiyo Kasai, 296–349. Leiden: Brill, 2023.
- Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid. *Die Lhan kar ma*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2008.
- Ikeda On 池田温. *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku* 中國古代寫本識語集錄 [Collected Colophons of Ancient Chinese Manuscripts]. Tokyo: Tōkyō daigaku bunka kenkyūjo, 1990.

*BuddhistRoad Paper* 1.3. Li, “Toward a History of Chödrup’s Monastic Activities”



- Imanishi, Junichi. *Das Pancavastukam und die Pancavastukavibhāṣā, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, I, Philologisch-historische Klasse*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Jin, Tao. “The Self-Imposed Textual Organization (*Kepan* 科判) of the *Qixinlun*: Some Major Forms and a Few Possible Problems.” *Dharma Drum Journal of Buddhist Studies* 21 (2007): 1–39.
- Kapstein, Matthew T. “A Dunhuang Tibetan Summary of the Transformation Text on Mulian Saving His Mother from Hell.” In *Dunhuang wenxian lunji* 敦煌文獻論集 [Collected Papers on Dunhuang Documents], edited by Hao Chunwen 郝春文, 235–247. Shenyang: Liaoning Renmin Chubanshe, 2001.
- Kapstein, Matthew T. “The Tibetan *Yulanpen Jing*.” In *Contributions to the Cultural History of Early Tibet*, edited by Matthew T. Kapstein and Brandon Dotson, 211–237. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Kawaguchi Eka 河口慧海. “Yabuki hakushi satsuei shōrai no nyū ryōga kyō kenkyū 矢吹博士撮影將來の入楞伽經研究 [A Study of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* Photographed and Brought in by Dr. K. Yabuki].” In *Meisha yoin kaisetsu: Tonkō shutsudo miden koitsu butten kaihō* 鳴沙餘韻解說: 燉煌出土未傳古逸佛典開寶 [Rare and Unknown Chinese Manuscripts Remains of Buddhist Literature Discovered in Tunhuang Collected by Sir Aurel Stein and Preserved in the British Museum], edited by Yabuki Keiki 矢吹慶輝, 430–478. Tokyo: Iwanami, 1933.
- Kellner, Birgit. “Using Concepts to Eliminate Conceptualization: Kamalaśīla on Nonconceptual Gnosis (*nīrvikalpajñāna*).” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 43 (2020): 39–80.
- Kritzer, Robert. “Tibetan Texts of *Garbhāvākraṅtisūtra*: Differences and Borrowings.” *The Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 15 (2012): 131–145.
- van der Kuijp, Leonard. “Some Remarks on the Meaning and Use of the Tibetan Word *bam po*.” *Zangxue xuekan* 藏学学刊 / *Journal of Tibetology* 5 (2009): 114–132.
- Li, Channa. “Challenging the Buddha’s Authority: A Narrative Perspective of the Power Dynamics between the Buddha and His Disciples.” PhD diss., Leiden University, 2019.
- Li, Channa. “A Survey of Tibetan *Sūtras* Translated from Chinese as Recorded in Tibetan Imperial Catalogues.” *Revue d’Etudes Tibétaines* 60 (2021): 174–219.
- Li, Channa. “Toward A Typology of Chōdrup’s (Tib. Chos Grub, Chin. Facheng 法成) Cursive Handwriting: A Palaeographical Perspective.” *BuddhistRoad Paper* 1.2 (2021).
- Li, Channa. “Tanguang and His Work in Tibetan Translation: Revisiting of IOL Tib J 26 and the Mahādeva Narrative.” *T’oung Pao*, forthcoming.
- Li, Channa. “Reconstructing a Tibetan *Mahāratnakūṣasūtra* Collection Translated from Chinese: New Light on the Early Translation History of *Dkon Brtsegs* Based on Dunhuang Manuscripts.” In *The Canons, Kangyurs, and Collections: Multidisciplinary Approaches in the Study of Tibetan Canonical Literature*, edited by Markus Viehbeck, Bruno Lainé, Kurt Tropper, and Verena Widorn. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, forthcoming.
- Liu, Cuilan. “Buddhist Litigants in Public Court: A Case Study of Legal Practices in Tibetan-Ruled Dunhuang (786–848).” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 139.1 (2019): 91–113.
- Maeda Yosinari 前田至成. “Goji bibasharon no kei-fu ni tsuite 五事毘婆沙論の系譜について [On the Genealogy of the *Pañcavastuka*].” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku*



- kenkyū 印度學佛教學研究 / *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 34.1 (1985): 242–249.
- Mair, Victor. *Tun-Huang Popular Narratives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Mak, Bill. “The Transmission of the *Grahamātrkādhāraṇī* and Other Buddhist Planetary Astral Texts.” *Pacific World* 20 (2018): 223–256.
- Masaaki Chikusa 竺沙雅章. *Chūgoku bukkyō shakaishi kenkyū* 中國佛教社會史研究 [Studies on the Social History of Buddhism in China]. Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1982.
- Meinert, Carmen. “The Conjunction of Chinese Chan and Tibetan *Rdzogs Chen* Thought: Reflections on the Tibetan Dunhuang Manuscripts IOL Tib J. 689-1 and PT 699.” In *Contributions to the Cultural History of Early Tibet*, edited by Matthew T. Kapstein and Brandon Dotson, 239–301. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Meinert, Carmen. “People, Places, Texts, and Topics: Another Look at the Larger Context of the Spread of Chan Buddhism in Eastern Central Asia during the Tibetan Imperial and Post-Imperial Period (7th–10th C.).” In *Buddhism in Central Asia III—Impacts of Non-Buddhist Influences, Doctrines*, edited by Lewis Doney, Carmen Meinert, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Yukiyo Kasai, 257–291. Leiden: Brill, 2023.
- Meng, Xiaoqiang, “A Preliminary Study of the Dunhuang Tibetan Fragments of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Ekottarakarmaśataka* (I): *Tarjanīyakarman*.” *Acta Asiatica Varsoviensia* 34.2 (2021): 205–241.
- Mimaki Katsumi 御牧克己. “Daijō Muryōju shūyō-kyō 大乘無量壽宗要經 [The Mahāyāna *Aparimitāyursūtra*.]” In *Kōza tonkō 7: Tonkō to chūgoku bukkyō* 講座敦煌 7: 敦煌と中国仏教 [Lectures on Dunhuang 7: Dunhuang and Chinese Buddhism], edited by Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮 and Fukui Fumimasa 福井文雅, 167–172. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1984.
- Nishioka Soshū 西岡祖秀. “‘Putun Bukkyō-shi’ mokurokubu sakuin I-III 「プトウン仏教史」目録部索引 I-III [Index to the Catalogue Section of *Bu ston’s History of Buddhism* I-III].” *Tōkyō Daigaku bungakubu bunka kōryū kenkyū shisetsu kenkyū kiyō* 東京大學文學部文化交流研究施設研究紀要 [Research Summary of the Cultural Exchange Research Institute, Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo] 4 (1980): 61–92; 5 (1981): 43–94; 6 (1983): 47–201.
- Ngawang Samten and Janardan Pandey, ed. *Dhīḥ: A Review of Rare Buddhist Texts* 39. Samath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2005.
- Pachow, Werner. “A Study of the *Twenty-Two Dialogues on Mahāyāna Buddhism*.” *Chinese Culture* 20.1 (1979a): 35–64.
- Pachow, Werner. “The Translation of the *Twenty-Two Dialogues on Mahāyāna*.” *Chinese Culture* 20.2 (1979b): 35–110.
- Powers, John. “Lost in China, Found in Tibet: How Wonch’uk Became the Author of the Great Chinese Commentary.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 15.1 (1992): 95–103.
- Ren Xiaobo 任曉波. *Zangyi Shan’ e yinguojing duikan yu yanjiu* 藏譯《善惡因果經》對勘與研究 [Studies on the Tibetan Translation of the *Shan’ e yinguo jing*]. Beijing: Renmin daxue, 2012.
- Rong Xinjiang 榮新江. *Guiyijun shi yanjiu* 歸義軍史研究 [Studies of the History of Guiyijun]. Shanghai: Shanghai guiji chubanshe, 1996.
- Rong Xinjiang 榮新江 and Yuxin 余欣. “Dunhuang xieben bianwei shili—yi fachengjiang yuqie shidi lun xuesheng biji wei zhongxin 敦煌寫本辨偽示例—以法成講《瑜伽師地論》學生筆記為中心 [Case Studies of How to Identify Fake



- Records: Centring on the Lecture Notes on Chödrup's *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*].” In *Dunhuang xue riben xue: Harumichi Ishizuka jiaoshou tuizhi jinian wenji* 敦煌學·日本學: 石塚晴通教授退職記念文集 [Dunhuang Studies and Japanology: Festschrift for Professor Harumichi Ishizuka], edited by Ishizuka Harumichi kyōju taishoku kinen kai 石塚晴通教授退職記念会, 65–74. Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe, 2005.
- Saerji. “Revisiting the Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish.” In *Illuminating the Dharma: Buddhist Studies in Honour of Venerable Professor KL Dhammajoti*, edited by Toshiichi Endo, 321–336. Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong, 2021.
- van Schaik, Sam. *Tibetan Zen: Discovering A Lost Tradition*. Boston: Snow Lion, 2015.
- Sakuraba Bunkyō 桜部文鏡. “Shuko makatai kyō to Ryōga kyō to nochi bettobon ni tsuite 衆許摩訶帝經と楞伽經との西藏本に就て [About the Tibetan Versions of the *Zhongxumohedi Sūtra* and *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*].” *Ōtani gakuhō* 大谷学報 / *The Journal of Buddhist Studies and Humanities* 15.2 (1934): 60–67.
- Schaeffer, Kurtis and Leonard van der Kuijp. *An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od of Bcom ldan ral gri*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina. “D'un manuscrit tibétain des *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdayakārikā* de Nāgārjuna.” *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 3 (1987): 103–111.
- Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina. “Enacting Words: A Diplomatic Analysis of the Imperial Decrees [*Bkas bcad*] and Their Application in the *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* Tradition.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 25.1–2 (2002): 263–340.
- Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina and George Bonani. “Establishing a Typology of the Old Tibetan Manuscripts: A Multidisciplinary Approach.” In *Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries*, edited by Susan Whitfield, 184–215. London: British Library, 2002.
- Seyford Ruegg, David. *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1981.
- Silk, Jonathan A. *The Heart Sūtra in Tibetan: A Critical Edition of the Two Recensions Contained in the Kanjur*. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 1994.
- Silk, Jonathan A. “Chinese Sūtras in Tibetan Translation: A Preliminary Survey.” *The Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 22 (2019): 227–246.
- Silk, Jonathan A. “The Heart Sūtra as Dhāranī,” *Acta Asiatica Bulletin of The Institute of Eastern Culture* 121 (2021): 99–125.
- Skilling, Peter. “From bKa' bstan to bKa' 'gyur and bsTan 'gyur.” In *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon: Papers Presented at a Panel of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995*, edited by Helmut Eimer, 87–110. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997.
- Seigiguchi Shindai 關口眞大. “Daruma oshiyō zekkan ron (Tonkō shutsudo) wa gozu hōyū no senjutsu taru o ron zu 達摩和尚絶觀論 (燉煌出土) は牛頭法融の撰述たるを論ず [Examining the *Jueguan lun* from Dunhuang Attributed to Monk Damo as Being Written by Farong of the Oxhead School].” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 / *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 5.1 (1957): 208–211.



- Sørensen, Henrik H. “Guiyijun and Buddhism at Dunhuang: A Year by Year Chronicle.” *BuddhistRoad Paper* 4.2 (2019).
- Sørensen, Henrik H. “Tibetan Tantra and Chinese Esoteric Buddhism in the Melting Pot: A Study of a Chinese Recension of the Twenty-Eight Vajra Precepts.” *BuddhistRoad Paper* 2.2 (2019).
- Sørensen, Henrik H. “Buddhism in Dunhuang.” In *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism. Volume Four. History: Part Two: Central and East Asia*, edited by Richard Bowring and Vincent Eltschinger, 27a–42b. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2023.
- Steinkellner, Ernst. “Who Is Byang chub rdzu ’phrul? Tibetan and Non-Tibetan Commentaries on the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*: A Survey of the Literature.” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 4.5 (1989): 229–251.
- Szerb, Janos. *Bu ston’s History of Buddhism in Tibet*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990.
- Takakusu, Junjirō. “A Comparative Study of the *Tripitaka* and the Tibetan *Dsañ-Lun, the Wise Man and the Fool*.” In *Actes du douzieme Congres international des orientalistes—Rome 1899, Tome 2*, edited by the 12th International Congress of Orientalists, 11–32. Florence: Société Typographique Florentine, 1901.
- Takeuchi, Tsuguhito. *Old Tibetan Contracts from Central Asia*. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan, 1995.
- Tatz, Mark. *Candragomin and the Bodhisattva Vow*. PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 1978.
- Tatz, Mark. “The Life of Candragomin in Tibetan Historical Tradition.” *The Tibet Journal* 7.3 (1982): 3–22.
- Ueyama Daishūn 上山大峻. “Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi shamohōjō no kenkyū (jō) 大蕃國大德三藏法師沙門法成の研究 (上) [Studies on the Great Monk of Tibetan Empire, *Tripitakācārya, Śramaṇa Chōdrup*].” *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方學報 / *Journal of Oriental Studies, Kyoto* 38 (1967): 133–98.
- Ueyama Daishūn 上山大峻. “Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi shamohōjō no kenkyū (ge) 大蕃國大德三藏法師沙門法成の研究 (下) [Studies on the Great Monk of Tibetan Empire, *Tripitakācārya, Śramaṇa Chōdrup*].” *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方學報 / *Journal of Oriental Studies, Kyoto* 39 (1968): 119–222.
- Ueyama Daishūn 上山大峻. *Tonkō bukkyō no kenkyū* 敦煌の研究 [Studies on Dunhuang Buddhism]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1990.
- Ueyama Daishūn 上山大峻. “Go oshō zōsho mokuroku (kō 76) ni tsuite 吳和尚藏書目録(効 76) について [Concerning the Catalogue of Monk Wu’s Library on Manuscript Xiao 76].” *Nihon chibetto gakkai kaihō* 日本西藏学会会報 / *Report of the Japanese Association for Tibetan Studies* 41–42 (1997): 3–9.
- Verhagen, Pieter. “A Ninth-Century Tibetan Summary of the Indo-Tibetan Model of Case-Semantics.” In *Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Narita 1989*, edited by Shōren Ihara and Zuihō Yamaguchi, 833–844. Narita: Naritasan Shinshoji, 1992.
- Walter, Michael. “The Significance of the Term ‘ring lugs’.” *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 51.3 (1998): 309–319.
- Wang Yao 王堯. “Tufan yishi Guan Facheng shenshi shiji kao 吐蕃譯師管·法成身世事蹟考 [Studies on the Life Activities of the Tibetan Translator ‘Gos Chōdrup].” In *Xizang wenshi kaixin ji* 西藏文史考信集 [Collection of Studies on Tibetan Literature and History], 17–33. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, 1994.



- Wang Yao 王堯. “P.T.1297(2), 1096r, 1084 hao suzhuang yiwen P.T.1297(2), 1096r, 1084 號訴狀譯文 [A Translation of the Texts of Petition in P. T. 1297(2), 1096r, 1084].” In *Dunhuang Tufan wenshu yishi* 敦煌吐蕃文書譯釋 [Translations and Commentaries of Dunhuang Tibetan Manuscripts]. Beijing: Zhongguo zangxue chubanshe, 2002.
- Willemen, Charles, Bart Dessein, and Collett Cox. *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*. Brill: Leiden, 1998.
- Wu Qiyu 吳其昱. “Daibankoku daitoku sanzōhōshi hōjō denkō 大蕃国大德 三藏法師 法成伝考 [Studies on the Biography of the Great Monk of Tibetan Empire, *Tripitakācārya Chōdrup*].” In *Kōza Tonkō 7: Tonkō to Chūgoku bukkyō* 講座敦煌 7: 敦煌と中国仏教 7 [Lectures on Dunhuang Studies 7: Dunhuang and Chinese Buddhism], edited by Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮 and Fukui Fumimasa 福井文雅, 383–410. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1984.
- Xu Jian 徐健. “Tufan gaoseng wu facheng shengping santi 吐蕃高僧吴法成生平三题 [Three Aspects of the Life of the Tibetan Monk Wu Chōdrup].” *Dunhuang xue jikan* 敦煌学辑刊 / *Journal of the Dunhuang Studies* 1 (2017): 37–44.
- Yamaguchi Zuihō. “The Fiction of King Dar Ma’s Persecution of Buddhism.” In *De Dunhuang au Japon: Études Chinoises et Bouddhiques Offertes à Michel Soymié*, edited by Jean Pierre Drège, 230–258. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1996.
- Yoshimura Shūki 芳村修基. “Kamarashīra zō tōgankyōshaku hōjō yaku no suitei カマラシーラ造『稲芋経釈』法成訳の推定 [The Surmise that Chōdrup Translated the *Sālistambaka-ṭīkā* Composed by Kamalaśīla].” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 / *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 7.4 (1956): 128–129.
- Zhang Yanqing 张延清. “Fanyijia jiaoyue dashi facheng jiqi jiaojing mulu 翻译家校阅大师法成及其校经目录 [The Great Translator and Proofreader Chōdrup and a Catalogue of His Proofread Manuscripts].” *Dunhuang xue jikan* 敦煌学辑刊 / *Journal of the Dunhuang Studies* 3 (2008): 75–93.
- Zheng Binglin 郑炳林. *Dunhuang beiming zan jishi* 敦煌碑銘贊輯釋 [An Annotated Compilation of Eulogy Texts in Dunhuang]. Lanzhou: Gansu jiaoyu chubanshe, 1992.
- Zheng Binglin 郑炳林. “Dujiaoshou Zhang Jinxuan heshang shengping shiji kao 都教授张金炫和尚生平事迹考 [A Study of the Life Activities of the Head Monk Zhang Jinxuan].” *Dunhuang yanjiu* 敦煌研究 / *Journal of the Dunhuang Studies* 31 (1997): 96–102.
- Zhu Lishuang 朱丽双. “Yutian aluohan shouji duikan yu yanjiu 于阗阿罗汉授记对勘与研究 [Comparisons and Studies of the *Li yul gyi dgra bcom pas lung bstan pa*].” In *Zhang Guangda xiansheng bashi huadan zhushou lunwen ji* 张广达先生八十华诞祝寿论文集 [Festschrift for the Eightieth Birthday of Professor Zhang Guangda], 605–676. Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 2010.