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Kyoto University
A handlist of Buddhist Sogdian texts

Yutaka Yoshida

1 Introduction

In 1991 I published an article entitled “Buddhist literature in Sogdian” and gave a list of those Buddhist Sogdian texts that had been identified by then. Later in 1993 I supplemented the list by adding some new identifications made in the meantime. More than twenty years have passed since then and the number of the identified text has increased to such an extent that one needs to prepare a list afresh. In this article I survey the Buddhist Sogdian texts so far identified or mentioned in one way or other in various literatures, so that those who have interest in Sogdian Buddhism or Central Asian Buddhism in general might get latest information about Buddhist Sogdian texts so far known.

2 Sogdian Buddhists and Buddhist Sogdian texts: General remark

Sogdian is an East Middle Iranian language once spoken in Sogdiana located between the two great rivers of Central Asia, the Amu-Darya and the Syr-Darya. Due to the Islamization of the area, Sogdian became extinct by the end of the 10th century and the speakers shifted to New Persian and later Uzbeki, a variety of the Turkic language. Sogdiana consisted of several oasis-states, which were located along the rivers of Zarafshan and Kashka-Darya, the leading city states being Samarqand and Bukhara. Before the Islamization of Central Asia, in particular during the Sui and Tang Dynasties (581-907), the Sogdians played a leading role as international traders along the Silk Road.
connecting China and the West, with the result that a considerable number of Sogdians settled in East Turkestan and China, where Buddhism was flourishing. On the history of Sogdians in general see de la Vaissière 2005. As Xuanzang (602-664) witnessed around 630 CE in Samarkand, the Sogdians were Zoroastrians and did not believe in Buddhism, cf. Watters, 94. This observation combined with very few Buddhist remains excavated from former Sogdiana leads one to assume that Buddhism did not spread to Sogdiana, cf. Compareti 2008. Thus, discovery of many Buddhist Sogdian texts from Dunhuang, Turfan, and Shorchuq (near modern Karashar) indicates that the Sogdians adopted the religion only after they immigrated to the area where Buddhism was flourishing. This situation was rightly described by Tremblay 2007: 95-97 as “a colonial phenomenon,” which most clearly manifests itself in the fact that bulk of the Sogdian texts are based on the Chinese prototypes including apocryphal texts produced in China. Their dependence on Chinese texts may also be betrayed by the Chinese texts phonetically transcribed in Sogdian script. On the standard and the nature of Sogdian translation from the Chinese originals see Meisterernst and Durkin-Meisterernst 2005, 2009, and 2012. Activities of the Buddhist Sogdians in China have been studied by me, cf. Yoshida 2013a and forthcoming.

Only one text generally known as “The Sūtra of condemnation of intoxicating drink” discovered in Dunhuang bears the date of 728 CE (cf. below (47)), when it was translated in Luoyang. While nothing linguistic or paleographic indicates that the others are significantly younger or older than it, the latest stage is represented by those which show Uighur elements in the colophons. In view of the fact that the Uighurs settled in the Turfan Basin in the latter half of the 9th century, these texts are likely to be dated to the 10th century. Most of the Buddhist Sogdian texts are more or less faithful translations based on Chinese originals, while only a few others seem to have been based on prototypes in either Sanskrit or Tocharian, although it has not been possible to trace their originals. Buddhist Sogdian texts are unique among those in other Central Asian languages like Tocharian, Khotanese, and Uighur not to mention Tibetan and
Mongolian in that Buddhism never attained the status of a state religion among the Sogdians. This means that there were no state organized saṃghas among Sogdian monks, and that Sogdian Buddhists were not able to enjoy support from the state for translating and copying texts.

Lack of organized community may have prevented the establishment of standard Buddhist terminology in Sogdian. Recently some vinaya texts have been discovered where *poyiti* — Skt. *prāyaścitta*, *pāyattika*, etc. meaning “atonement” is rendered with *p’ytyk*, *p’ytk*, and *p’yty*, cf. Yoshida 2010: 92 n. 13. (On the background of various Indian forms of this term see von Hinüber.) This situation is only understandable when one considers the fact that the Sogdians did not belong to a particular school, nor did they have their own tradition of ordination but just adopted the form found in original texts. Nevertheless, the texts which have come down to us share a considerable number of common terms. *wytxwy* (‘†) *sryt’m* translating Chin. *fannao* 煩恼 “kleśa” is most conspicuous in that the combination is quite common among Buddhist texts, and that each component is not attested except for this combination. *pk’p’m* meaning “Baghavān” is another term encountered in various texts both from Dunhuang and Turfan; it is based on Chin. *baoqiefan* 薄伽梵, which in turn is the transposition of the Sanskrit word, Sims-Williams 1983:138. Sanskrit forms encountered in the Buddhist Sogdian texts need to be studied extensively. On this subject see E. Provasi 2013.

3 List

Here follows the list of Buddhist Sogdian texts so far published or studied. Some unpublished texts are also referred to when they are identified by the present author, who will edit them in the near future.

(A) The Sogdian texts which have been identified with an extant Chinese Buddhist text (together with the corresponding Chinese passage in the *Taisho Tripiṭaka*) are as
follows. In the list, D, T, and Sh stand for Dunhuang, Turfan, and Shorchuq respectively. The arrangement of texts is in accordance with that found in the *Taisho Tripitaka* (TT with running numbers):

(1) *Śūka-sūtra* or *Karmavibhaṅga* 佛為首迦長者說業報差別經 (TT 80). T: One unpublished fragment So 14700(22) can be compared with TT vol. 1, 894c22-26. On a Dunhuang fragment, L93, which has been called *Śūka-sūtra*, see BLS: 303.

(2) *Angulimālīya-sūtra* 央掘魔羅經 (TT 120). D: Cited in P2, lines 914-939 (TT vol. 2, 54c22-27). On P2 see below (48).


(5) *Vajracchedikā-sūtra* 金剛般若波羅蜜經 (TT 235). (i) D: BSTBL: 3-5 (TT vol. 8, 749a6-21). (ii) T: STii, text 8 (TT vol. 8, 752b24-c2). Two unidentified commentaries are known among the Turfan fragments, both unpublished: One calls itself as βz’yryn’y pr’tny’ wyōβ’γ “Vajracchedikā-prajñā-śāstra”, and the other βz’yrn’k wyōβ’γ “Vajra-śāstra”, cf. Reck 2013. The two texts cite several passages from the sūtra, one of which is edited in Yoshida 2009a: 387 (TT vol. 8, 750b14-18).


(8) *Ratnarāsi-sūtra* 大寶積經 (TT 310(44)). (i) T: One unpublished fragment So 14230(2) (TT vol. 11, 639b15-21, 639b26-c1). (ii) T: Unpublished fragments So 10201(9) + So
18374(1) + So 10200(9), etc. (TT vol. 11, 643c26-644a11, etc.)


(15) Dīrghanākapariprājakaparpriyacchā-sūtra 長爪梵志請問經 (TT 584) D: P5 (TT vol. 14, 968). The text is followed by a formula for receiving the eight commandments, cf. (52) below. On the nature of the Sogdian translation see B. Meisterernst/ D. Durkin-Meisterernst 2012.

(17) *Buddhānusmṛtisamādhisāgara-sūtra* or *Dhyāna-text* 佛說觀佛三昧海經 (TT 643).
D: BSTBL: 53-77 (TT vol. 15, 690c6-692c7).

(18) *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra* 金光明最勝王經 (TT 665). T: STii text 7 (TT vol. 16, 426a7-27).


(20) *Foshuoshifeishijing* 佛說時非時經 “Sūtra spoken by Buddha on time and not-time” (TT 794). T: Kudara/Sundermann 1987 (TT vol. 17, 738b or 739a). In the ms. the text is preceded by (30) below.

(21) *Padmacintāmaṇidhāraṇī-sūtra* 觀世音菩薩秘密藏如意輪陀羅尼神咒經 (TT 1082).
D: BSTBL: 12-17 (TT vol. 20, 199b12-200a2). Two passages are cited from the same sūtra (199c15-23, 199c24-200a4) in other Dunhuang texts P14, 15, 30, on which see below. Cf. Henning 1945: 465, n. 2.

(22) *Guanzizaipushunyilunniansongyigui* 観自在菩薩如意輪念誦儀軌 (TT 1085). D: The texts of P14, P15, P30 cite a short passage (TT vol. 20, 204a21-b3) from this work by Amoghvajra (705-774). An illustration of the mudrā called “samādhi of a group of Buddhas” accompanies the description, cf. BLs: 295-6. The entire work seems to prescribe the rituals for worshipping the bodhisattva named Cakravarticintāmaṇi.

(23) *Amoghapāśahṛdaya-sūtra* 不空羈索神心經 (TT 1093, 1094, 1095?). D: P7. The Sogdian version is an abbreviated paraphrase of the original. The immediate source, not necessarily Chinese, of the Sogdian text is not known. On this problem see also Meisterernst/Durkin-Meisterernst 2009. Yoshida 1991: 98-100 prefers to assume a prototype in Sanskrit.

(24) *Nīlakaṇṭha-dhāraṇī* 千手千眼觀自在菩薩廣大圓滿無礙大悲心陀羅尼呪本 / 千手千眼觀自在菩薩心陀羅尼經 (TT 1061, 1111). D: de la Vallée Poussin/Gauthiot and Lévi. The dhāraṇī written in Brāhmī is accompanied by its transcription in Sogdian script. (Similarly, Sanskrit *vidyās* followed by comments in Sogdian are known in Turfan texts, see Reck apud Wille 2004: 72-78.)

(25) *Dicangpusatuoluonijing* 地藏菩薩陀羅尼經 (TT 1159B). D: P18. The dhāraṇī of the
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sūtra (TT vol. 20, 659b) is transcribed in Sogdian script.

(26) Dalunjingangzongchitouluonijing 大輪金剛總持陀羅尼經 (TT 1230). T: One unpublished small fragment corresponding to TT vol. 21, 165b2-6. The ms. was recycled to write a Sanskrit text, cf. Wille 2012, SHT 2348, p. 436.

(27) Buddhabhāṣitamahābhiṣekardhdarāṇī-sūtra 佛說灌頂七萬二千神王護比丘呪經 (TT 1331). T: L57 (TT vol. 21, 531a15-20).

(28) Dharmaguptaka-vinaya or Sifenlü 四分律 (TT 1428?). T: So 10921, 19530a, b; Yoshida 2008: 330-32 and Reck (forthcoming b). The text is closest to the 20th to 24th pāyattikas of the vinaya (TT vol. 22, 649b-650c), while some parts can be compared with TT 1804 (四分律刪繁補闕行事録), vol. 40, 78b/c.

(29) Caturvargavinaya-prātimokṣa 四分僧戒本 (TT 1430). T: Yoshida 2000 (TT vol. 22, 1028a4-9). So 10200(8) and So 10302 may also belong to another ms. of this work, cf. Yoshida 2008, 331-32.

(30) Foshuofanjiezuibaoqingzhongjing 仏說犯罪報應中經 “Sūtra spoken by Buddha on the lightness and heaviness of the sin of transgression of the Sīla” (TT 1467). T: Kudara/Sundermann 1987 (TT vol. 24, 910c10-13). In the ms. this text precedes (20).


(32) Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya 阿毘達磨俱舍論 (TT 1558). T: STii text 9 and Yoshida 1986: 519. King Prasenajit poses a question to the Buddha concerning the time when Cakravartin king appears and the king’s question and the Buddha’s answer are closely paralleled by TT vol. 29, 64b19-20, 25-27.

(33) Lengqieshiziji 楞伽師資記 (TT 2837). T: Unpublished fragments So 10100o and So 10650(25) + So 10311 corresponding respectively to vol. 85, 1285a25-b02 and 1283b13-18. This is one of the earliest texts representing Chan Buddhism.

(34) Dafangguanghuayanshiepingjing 大方廣華嚴十惡品經 (TT 2875, apocrypha). D: Cited in P2, lines 977-1026 (TT vol. 85, 1360c12-24), cf. Yoshida 2013a. On P2 see
below (48).


(37) Dharmarāja-sūtra 法王經 (TT 2883, apocrypha). (i) T: Yoshida 1985a: 50-54 (TT vol. 85, 1384c17-23). (ii) D: P23 (TT vol. 85, 1386c22-28). This was also a favorite text of Chan Buddhists.

(38) Foweixinwangpusashuotoutuojing 佛為心王菩薩說頭陀經 (TT 2886). D: BSTBL: 33-51. Previously it was called Dhūta text. In the meantime the Chinese original has been discovered, cf. Yoshida 1996 and Fang Guangchang: 251-328. This text is also related to Chan Buddhism.

(B) The Sogdian texts of which the direct prototypes are not yet known, but for which some specific identity can be provided:

(a) The texts translated from Tocharian/Sanskrit originals belonging to the Sarvāstivādin school of the northern Silk Road:

(39) Prasenajit fragment. T: STii text 9. See also (32) above.

(40) Story about king Kāñcanasāra from the Daśakaramapathāvadānamāla. T: Sundermann 2006. The corresponding Uighur text indicates that they were translated independently from the Tocharian original, cf. also Yoshida 2002: 197.


(42) Divyāavadāna. T: Sims-Williams 1996: 307. One fragment was identified by D. Maue as containing one verse in Sanskrit accompanied by its Sogdian translation written in Brāhmī script.

(43) Story about King Bimbisāra and heretics. T: Sims-Williams 1981: 235, Livšič 1996,
and BLS: 308.

(44) Story about kings Mahākapphina and Prasenajit. T: Two unpublished fragments (So 18240 and So 18241).

(45) Law (or Method) for meditation. T: Henning 1940: 59-62 and Kudara/Sundermann 1987: 347-48. Its colophon states that it was translated from Kuchean or Tocharian B.

(C) Other miscellaneous texts:

(46) Jātaka or avadāna concerning two brothers of differing qualities. D: Reichelt 1928: 57-59 and L92. Two small joinable fragments (Sims-Williams 1976: 53, Fragment 11 and S5863) also belong to the same text.

(47) The Sūtra of the condemnation of intoxicating drink. D: BSTBL: 7-11. Its colophon, on which see above, claims that it was translated from the Indian original.

(48) The Sūtra of the condemnation of meat. D: P2 and BLS: 297-99, 311. Its colophon states that it was translated in Changan. For the three texts cited in it, see (1), (19), and (34). Three small fragments from Turfan show the parallel text, which represents an independent translation, cf. Yoshida 2008: 335-37.

(49) The Sūtra of the condemnation of meat and intoxicating drink. D: P21 and BLS: 299.

(50) A text relating to Chan Buddhism. D: Three fragments (P9, P10, P11) from the same manuscript. On the text cited in P9 see (35). Cf. also BLS: 313-14.


(52) Formula for receiving the eight commandments. D: Yoshida 1985 and BLS 299-301. The text is preceded by (15) above.

(53) Avalokiteśvarasyaṇamāṣṭaṭakastotra(?). D: P8 and P8bis, cf. also BLS: 294. Other fragments belonging to P8bis see Sims-Williams 1976: 51-53 and Yoshida
The Sanskrit title was invented by Benveniste on the Sogdian designation, cf. Benveniste 1940: 105. On the Udānavarga verses cited in the text see Yoshida 1990: 106 and idem 2010: 91-92. For its long colophon, which states that it was translated in Dunhuang, see Henning 1946: 735-38.

(D) Buddhist Chinese texts transcribed in Sogdian script. Since the Chinese forms found in (55) and (56) are basically the same as those found in Sino-Uighur texts (cf. Yoshida 1994), they could represent Uighur Buddhism. In particular, the handwriting of (56) is similar to that of an Uighur fragment U 8004, one side of which shows the Chinese Vajracchedikā text (TT vol. 8, 751a7-11) in Sogdo-Uighur script.


(55) Jingangwuliwen 金剛五礼文. T: Yoshida 1994. The Chinese text was popular among the Chan Buddhists of the 10th century Dunhuang. Similar but unidentified texts are found in So 10675 and So 10788(1).

(56) Liangzhaoqushisongjingangjing 梁朝傅大士頌金剛經 (TT 2732). T: So 20218 identified by Hirose 2010 (TT vol. 85, 1b28-c4).
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Yoshida, Y. (tr. by Y. Kasai and Ch. Reck) "Die buddhistischen sogdischen Texte in der Berliner


Yoshida, Y. 吉田豐 "Kango butten to Chūōjia no shogengo, moji: Chūsei irango, tokuni sogudogo butten no baai 漢語仏典と中央アジアの諸言語・文字：中世イラン語、特にソグド語仏典の場合 " (forthcoming).

**ADDENDA**

After submitting the paper I came to notice that an unpublished fragment of the German Turfan Collection So 14628 contains the text corresponding to *Foshuofumingjing* 佛說佛名經 (TT 440, vol. 14, 115b14-c2). Virtually the same text is found in TT41, vol. 14, 186b-c. Strangely enough, although this fragment belongs to the same manuscript as So 10330 and So 10335, the latter two do not seem to attest any text corresponding to the Chinese.