Features of the Underlying Language of
Zhi Qian's Chinese Translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*[*]

Seishi Karashima

Prologue

It was in the early summer of 1988 when I visited Prof. Eric Zürcher at the Sinological Institute at Leiden University, whom I had long respected, with the thought of studying under his guidance. We discussed various matters including the methodology of studying Chinese Buddhist translations the whole afternoon. When he asked me what texts of Classical Chinese of the 2nd to 6th centuries were so as to compare them with the Chinese Buddhist texts of the same periods, I replied instantly that they were the commentaries of the *Shisanjing Zhushu* 十三經注疏 [Commentaries and Explanations to the Thirteen Classics], the *Wenxuan* 文選 [The Selections of Refined Literature] and the *Shishuo Xinyu* 世説新語 [Contemporary Anecdotes of the World] which I have enjoyed reading since my undergraduate times. Thereupon, he recommended that I use Ge Hong 葛洪 (283–343 C.E.)'s *Baopuzi* 抱朴子 [The Master Embracing Simplicity] instead, which has become my favourite book since then. The conversation with him was thus very enlightening and interesting, but I also found that our differences of interest and methodology were greater than I had thought. I, then, gave up the idea of moving to Leiden from Beijing University where I was at that time. When I left his office, he told me softly that my research on the Chinese Buddhist translations by comparing the Sanskrit and Prakrit versions were important as well as interesting, but nobody would recognise my work, meaning that I would not obtain a proper job at any university. Much later on, in June 1995, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of The Institute of Eastern Culture (東方学会), Prof. Zürcher was invited to give a lecture in Kyoto, where I had lived since 1994 after my nine years of study abroad. I met him and told him that his prediction had been quite right. Fortunately, later on, I was able to obtain this present job and therefore, I do not need to be concerned anymore about whether my methodology of philological studies of Chinese Buddhist texts in comparison with Indian texts is acknowledged or not. However, his prediction still rings in my ears.

I Languages of Mahāyāna Buddhist scriptures

From the time of Śākyamuni Buddha until around the 2nd–3rd centuries, the Buddhist scriptures were transmitted (orally at first and written later) not in Sanskrit, but in Prakrit (i.e. colloquial languages). Śākyamuni himself, probably preached in Old Māgadhī, the dialect of Magadha and encouraged his disciples to use colloquial languages. In the Buddhist communities, and the listeners to their sermons were not always particularly intellectual but rather ordinary people. If the Buddhist teachings were preached in a formal, elaborate and high-class language, such as Sanskrit, then such people would not understand them. Therefore, the use of colloquial languages was inevitable.

I have written elsewhere[1] how the shift of languages and the ways of transmission of the so-called Mahāyāna Buddhist scriptures took place, namely:[2]

(1) Oral transmission in Prakrit (including Gāndhārī): 1st century B.C.E.

(2) Oral transmission in Prakrit / writing of Prakrit texts in Kharoṣṭhī: 1st–3rd centuries C.E.

(3) Broken Sanskrit mixed with Prakrit (2nd–3rd centuries C.E.)

(4) (Buddhist) Sanskrit; writing in Brāhmī (3rd/4th century C.E. onwards)

In 1999, a Sanskrit manuscript of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, written in the 12th–13th c. C.E., was discovered in the Potala Palace in Lhasa, Tibet and its edition was published by Taishō University, Japan. The text is greatly sanskritised, containing only sporadically colloquial forms. On the other hand, Zhi Qian 支謙 (fl. 222–252 C.E.)'s translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, namely *the Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經 (T. 14, no. 474), contains traces of its transmission in Prakrit (especially Gāndhārī) as we shall see below.

At first, we shall investigate the transliterated words in the *Weimojie jing*, followed by an analysis of the translated words which may tell us the features of its underlying language.

II Analysis of Transliterated Words

To know the aspects of the original Indian languages of Chinese translations, transliterations are most important, as they explicitly and directly reflect the original features. However, while examining them, we should take care not to include pre-existing transliterations, which had been already used in earlier translations. Therefore, when we analyse Zhi Qian's translations, made in the third century, we should exclude transliterations, such as *pusa* 菩薩 (*bosisat < bodhisattva), *axulun* 阿須倫 (*asura~*), *jialiuluo* 迦留羅 (*garuḷa < garuḍa*) *etc.*, all of which appear in the translations made in the 2nd century. Even though they appear in Zhi Qian's translations, he simply used pre-existing transliterations and these do not reflect the original texts from which he translated them.

In this article, the following abbreviations are used:

ZQ = Zhi Qian's translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, namely the *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經 (T. 14, no. 474)

Vkn = Sanskrit version of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*

Kj = Kumārajīva's translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, namely the *Weimojie suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說經

Xz = Xuanzang's translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, namely the *Shuo Wugoucheng jing* 說無垢稱經

EH = reconstructions of the Eastern Han (25–220 C.E.) Chinese sound system, posited by Coblin (1983)

MC = Middle Chinese reconstruction of the *Qieyun* 切韵 system

Gā = Gāndhārī; MI = Middle Indic; OIA = Old Indo-Aryan; Pā = Pāli; Skt = Sanskrit; T = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經

The following are the transliterations which first appear in Zhi Qian's *Weimojie jing*:

1. 維耶離[3] (519a9; EH. źjwəi źja ljei > MC. jiwi jia lje; Vkn I § 1. *Vaiśālī*; Kj. 537a7. 毘耶離; Xz. 557c5. 廣嚴城)

   Weiyeli 維耶離 shows that its original Indian form was either *Vaiśālī* or **Vaiyālī*.

2. 維摩詰 (520c24; EH. źjwəi ma khit > MC. jiwi muâ khjiet; Vkn II § 1. *Vimalakīrti*; Kj. 539a8. 維摩詰; Xz. 560b6. 無垢稱)

   An old manuscript of the *Weimojie jing* reads *Weimojie* 維摩鞊 (鞊: EH. kit > MC. kjiet) instead of the common *Weimojie* 維摩詰.[4] Also, Sengyou's *Chusanzangji ji* 出三藏記集 (510–518 C.E.) refers to Dharmarakṣa (ca. 233–311 C.E.)'s translation of the same *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* as the *Weimojie jing* 維摩鞊經 (T. 55, no. 2145, 7c1; cf. 8c16). Therefore, Wang Jinchuan assumes that *Weimojie* 維摩鞊 is the original form from which *Weimojie* 維摩詰 was created later on.[5]

3. 羅鄰那竭[6] (519b29; EH. la ljiən na gjiat > MC. lâ ljen nâ-[nâ:] gjɒt[gjät³]; Vkn I § 7. *Ratnākara*; Kj. 537b25. 寶積; Xz. 558b6. 寶性)

   Probably, this transliteration is based on the colloquial form **Ralaṃṇāgara* (< **Radaṇāgara* < *Ratanākara* [= Pā] < *Ratnākara*), indicating the development of OIA. *ratna* > MI. *ratana* > Gā. *radaṇa*[7] > **ralaṃṇa*.[8]

4. 不蘭迦葉[9] (522b9; EH. pju[pjət] lan kja[kra] śap > MC. pjəu[pjuət] lân kja[ka]

śjäp; Vkn III § 17. *Pūraṇa~ Kāśyapa*; Gā. *Puraṇo Kaśava*[10]; Kj.540c1. 富蘭那迦葉; Xz. 562b15. 滿迦葉波)

The character *ye* 葉 (EH. śap > MC. śjäp) shows that the Indian palatal *-ś-* was transcribed by a Chinese character, whose initial consonant is also palatal. Lokakṣema (支婁迦讖; fl. ca. 170–190 CE) translated the *Prajñāpāramitā* in 179 C.E., entitled the *Daoxing Banre jing* 道行般若經 and he rendered the Indian palatals *śa* and *śā* with the Chinese character *she* 舍 (EH. śja- > MC. śja-), which has the palatal initial *ś-*, e.g. 舍怛羅 (Gā. *śatthar* < Skt. *śāstṛ*), 舍利 (Skt. *śarīra*), 舍利弗 (BHS. *Śāriputra*).[11]

5. 摩軻(←訶)離瞿耶婁[12] (522b9; EH. ma kha ljei gj(w)o[kj(w)o] źja lou > MC. muâ khâ lje gju[kju] jia ləu; Vkn III § 17. *Maskarī Gośālīputra*; Pā. *Makkhali-Gosāla*; Pkt. *Maṅkhaliputta*; Gā. *Makhaliputra*[13]; Kj. 540c1. 末伽梨拘賒梨子; Xz. 562b15. 末薩羯離瞿舍離子)

Mokeli 摩軻離 indicates that its Indian original was *Makhali* (= Gā), while *Quyelou* 瞿耶婁 shows that its Indian original was either *Gośālo* or **Goyālo*.

6. 阿夷耑[14] (522b10; EH. ʔa źjiəi tuan > MC. ʔâ jii tuân; Vkn III § 17. *Ajita*; Kj. 540c2. 阿耆多; Xz. 562b16. 無勝)

The pronunciation of *duan* 耑 (EH. tuan > MC. tuân) does not agree with the supposed Indic original form (*da* or *ta*). Probably, *duan* 耑 is a corruption of *duo* 多 (EH. ta > MC. tâ) or *tuo* 陀 (EH. da > MC. dâ).[15] *Ayiduan* 阿夷耑 (read *duo* 多?) might be based on the Indic form **Ayita* or *Ayida* (= Gā).

7. 基耶今離[16] (522b10; EH. kiə źja kim ljei > MC. kjï jia kjəm lje; Vkn III § 17. *Keśakambala*; Kj. 540c2. 翅舍欽婆羅; Xz. 562b16. 髮褐)

Jiye 基耶 indicates that its Indian original was either *Keśa* or **Keya*, while *Jinli* 今離 (**-kammal(a)?* < *-kambala*) shows that OIA *-mb-* had developed into *-mm-* in the underlying language in the same way as can be found in the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* from Khotan and the Gāndhārī documents from Niya.[17]

[10.] Falk 2011: 16. e6. *Purano Kaśava*.

[11.] Cf. Krsh 2010: 755.

[12.] Probably, *he* 訶 (EH. ha > xâ) is a corruption of *ke* 軻 (EH. kha > MC. khâ); cf. the following transliterations of the same Indian name: T. 1, no. 22, 271c9. 莫軻離瞿耶婁 in the *Jizhiguo jing* 寂志果經 (translated by Zhu Tanwulan 竺曇無蘭 [fl. 381–395 C.E.]); T. 17, no. 813, 777c3. 摩軻(←訶)離瞿耶樓 in the *Wuxiwang jing* 無希望經 (translated by Dharmarakṣa).

[13.] Falk 2011: 16. e6.

[14.] Several editions erroneously read *Ayi* 阿夷 instead. Cf. T. 2, no. 125, 752b6. 阿夷耑 in the *Zengyi Ahan jing* 增壹阿含經 (translated by Gautama Saṃghadeva 瞿曇僧伽提婆 [fl. 383–98 C.E.]); T. 1, no. 22, 271c10. 阿夷耑 in the *Jizhiguo jing* 寂志果經 (cf. fn. 12); T. 17, no. 813, 777c3. 阿夷帝 in the *Wuxiwang jing* 無希望經 (cf. fn. 12).

[15.] Cf. T. 1, no. 1, 108b23. 阿夷陀 (**Ayida* < *Ajita*; see Karashima 1994: 204) in the *Chang-Ahanjing* 長阿含經, which was translated by Zhu Fonian 竺佛念, based on the recitation by a Kashmiri monk, Buddhayaśas, in 413 C.E.

[16.] Cf. T. 17, no. 813, 777c3. 基耶今離 in the *Wuxiwang jing* (cf. fn. 12); T. 1, no. 22, 271c10. 其耶今離 in the *Jizhiguo jing* (cf. fn. 12); T. 2, no. 125, 752b6. 瞿耶樓 in the *Zengyi Ahan jing* (cf. fn. 14).

[17.] Cf. Burrow1937: § 45; Brough 1962: §§ 46–47; Karashima 1994: 34–35.

8. 波休[18] (522b10; EH. pa hju > MC. puâ xjəu; Vkn III § 17. *Kakuda* [*Kātyāyana*]; Pā. *Kakudha, Pakudha*[19]; Kj. 540c2. 迦羅鳩馱; Xz. 562b16. 犎)

   Xiu 休 was usually used to transliterate Indic *hu, hū, ho*. Therefore, the Indic form underlying *Boxiu* 波休 is assumed to have been *Pakuha (< *Pakudha*). However, *xiu* 休 in this transliteration is still difficult to explain and hence, needs further investigation.

9. 迦旃先[20] (522b10; EH. kja[kra] tśjan sen > MC. kja[ka] tśjän sen; Vkn III § 17. [*Kakuda*] *Kātyāyana*; Pā. *Kaccāyana, Kātiyana*; Kj. 540c2. [迦羅鳩馱]迦旃延; Xz. 562b16. [犎]迦衍那)

   Xian 先 is probably a scribal error of *yan* 延; cf. ZQ. 522c14, 18. 迦旃延(Vkn III §§ 25, 26. *Kātyāyana*). *Jiazhanyan* 迦旃延 appears also in Lokakṣema's *Daoxing Banre jing* (179 C.E.): T. 8, no. 224, 430a15. 摩呵迦旃延 (EH. ma ha kja[kra] tśjan źjan; *Mahākaccāyan(a) < Mahākātyāyana*; cf. Krsh 2010: 320).

10. 比盧特(or 持)[21] (522b10; EH. bjiəi[bjiəi-] lɑ[lo] dək [or ḍiə] > MC. bi⁴[bi-⁴] luo dək [or ḍï]; Vkn III § 17. *Vairāṣṭrika-*[*putra*]; cf. Pā. *Velaṭṭha-putta, Velaṭṭhi-putta*; BHS. *Vairaṭika-putra, Vairaṭi-putra, Vairaṭī-putra, Vairaṭṭī-putra, Vairaḍī-putra etc.*[22]; Kj. 540c1f. [刪闍夜]毘羅胝[子]; Xz. 562b16. [想]吠多[子])

    The Indic form, underlying *Bilute* 比盧特(or *chi* 持), was probably *Veraḍika (< *Vairaṭika*) or *Veraḍi (< *Vairaṭi*). The vowel of the character *lu* 盧 is assumed to have been -*a* (*yu* 魚 group finals) in Old Chinese and later on -*wo* (*mo* 模 rhyme category) in the *Qieyun* 切韻 System (601 C.E.). The Chinese characters in this category, used in early Chinese Buddhist translations, are supposed to have contained the main vowel -*o*.[23] However, 盧 in *Bilute* 比盧特 in question, indicates that its main vowel was -*a* as in Old Chinese.

11. 阿夷(行)[24] (522b29; EH. ʔa źjiəi > MC. ʔâ jii; Vkn III § 21. *ādi*[*karmika*]; Kj. 540c25. 新[學]; Xz. 562c14. 新[學])

    Probably, this transliteration is based on the colloquial form of either *āyi or **ā'i*[25] < *ādi*.[26]

12. 阿夷(恬) (536b20, 22, 26; EH. ʔa źjiəi [dem] > MC. ʔâ jii [diem]; Vkn XII § 17, 18. *ādikarmika*; Kj. 557a19, 22, 27. 新學; Xz. 587b24, 29, c7. 初學)

---

18. Cf. T. 17, no. 813, 777c4. 披休 in the *Wuxiwang jing*; T. 2, no. 125, 752b6. 胇(*v.ll.* 般、波)休 in the *Zengyi Ahan jing*.

19. DPPN s.v. *Pakudha*; Akanuma, s.v. *Pakudha-kaccāyana*.

20. Cf. T. 17, no. 813, 777c4. 迦旃先 in the *Wuxiwang jing*; T. 2, no. 125, 752b6. 迦旃先 in the *Zengyi Ahan jing*.

21. Except for the *Koryŏ* Edition, other editions all read *Biluchi* 比盧持 (= the *Wuxiwang jing*, T. 17, no. 813, 777c4; the *Jizhiguo jing*, T. 1, no. 22, 271c10). Cf. T. 2, no. 125, 752b6. 毘盧持 in the *Zengyi Ahan jing*.

22. Cf. BHSD, s.v. *Saṃjayin Vairaṭīputra*.

23. Coblin 1983: 100–103; Karashima 1994: 58f. = 2006: 134f.; 1997: 37 = 2010: 141f.

24. Cf. T.8, no. 224, 452b2. 阿闍浮 (probably a transliteration of *ādibhūmi*) in Lokakṣema's *Daoxing Banre jing*, Krsh 2010: 10–11.

25. Cf. Prakrit. *āi* (< OIA. *ādi*).

26. In the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* from Khotan, -*d*- sporadically changed to -*y*- or disappeared; cf. Brough 1962: 86f. § 33.

Both the *Yiqiejing Yingyi* 一切經音義 [Pronunciations and Meanings in the Complete Buddhist Canon] (mid-7th c. C.E.) by Xuanying 玄應 and another Buddhist dictionary with the same title (807 C.E.) by Huilin 慧琳 quote *ayitian* 阿夷恬 as a single transliterated word[27] —— the authors of these lexicons must have mastered Sanskrit very well but were ignorant of Prakrit. However, *tian* 恬 is probably a scribal error of *huo* 活 (a translation of *karman*), and *ayi* 阿夷 is a transliteration of the colloquial form either *$\bar{a}yi$ or *$\bar{a}'i$[28].

13. 頒耨文陀尼(子)[29] (522b27; EH. pan nou mjən da nrjiəi[niəi-] > MC. pan nəu mjuən dâ ṇi[niei-]; Vkn III § 21. *Pūrṇo* [*Pūrṇa~*] *Maitrāyaṇī(putra)*; Pā. *Puṇṇo* [*Puṇṇa~*] *Mantānī(putta))*; Kj. 540c22. 富樓那彌多羅尼[子]; Xz. 滿慈[子])
    Bannouwentuoni 頒耨文陀尼 agrees with Pā. *Puṇṇa Mantānī(putta)*, while it differs from BHS. *Pūrṇa Maitrāyaṇī(putra)*. The transliteration *wen tuo* 文陀 (EH. mjən da) indicates that, in the underlying language of the Chinese translation, *Mantā-* had developed into *Mandā-*.

14. 阿那律[30] (522c25; EH. ʔa na ljwət > MC. ʔâ nâ-[nâ:] ljwet); Vkn III § 28. *Aniruddha*; BHS = Pa. *Anuruddha*; Gā. *Aṇorudha*[31]; Kj. 541a23. 阿那律; Xz. 563a26. [大]無滅)
    Probably, the underlying form of *Annalü* 阿那律 was *Anaruddha* (< *Anuruddha*).

15. 阿維羅提 (534c21; EH. ʔa źjwəi la dei > MC. ʔâ jiwi lâ diei; Vkn XI § 3. *Abhirati*; Gā. *Avhiradi*[32]; Kj. 555b6. 名妙喜; Xz. 584c17. 妙喜)
    The character *wei* 維 in *Aweiluoti* 阿維羅提 indicates that its underlying form was not *Abhirati* but its Gāndhārī form *Avhiradi* or *Aviradi*.

16. 俾沙闍羅耶 (535c10; EH. pie sra dźja la źja > MC. pjie:[4] ṣa źja lâ jia; Vkn XII § 7. *Bhaiṣajyarāja*; Kj. 556b3. 藥王; 586a29. 藥王)
    Bishasheluoye 俾沙闍羅耶 is probably based on Gāndhārī *Bheṣaja-raya*[33]. This transliteration is important for the investigation of the underlying language as it indicates that the translator differentiated between the original *ja* and *ya* by using different Chinese characters, namely *she* 闍 (EH. dźja > źja) to render the sound *ja* (< *jya*) and *ye* 耶 (źja > jia) to transcribe *ya* (< *ja*).

[27.] See the *Yiqiejing Yinyi* of Xuanying: "'阿夷恬', 徒兼反。梵言也。此譯云'新學', 亦言'新發意'也。" (*Zhonghua Dazangjing* 中華大藏經, vol. 56, no. 1163, 939b14f.), while Huilin quotes this sentence in his *Yiqiejing Yinyi*: T. 54, no. 2128, 497b21.

[28.] Cf. fn. 25.

[29.] Cf. T. 15, no. 632, 461b4. 邠(OC. pjiən > MC. pjen)耨文陀尼弗羅 in Zhi Qian's *Huiyin Sanmei jing* 慧印三昧經; T. 9, no. 263, 94b27. 邠耨文陀尼(子) in Dharmarakṣa's *Zheng Fahua jing* 正法華經; Krsh 2010: 43. 邠那文陀弗, 邠那文陀羅弗, *ib*. 163. 分漫陀尼弗; Karashima 2013: 177, *ib*. 2014: 459.

[30.] The same transliteration appears also in the <u>*Annalü Banian jing* 阿那律八念經</u>, which the traditional catalogues ascribe to Zhi Yao 支曜 of the Eastern Han Dynasty, T. 1, no. 46, 835f. However, it is doubtful whether or not this scripture was truly made in the Eastern Han Dynasty.

[31.] Salomon 2008: 185, 79b.

[32.] Nasim Khan 71.24, 25.

[33.] Cf. Nasim Khan 36.15. *bheṣaja*, *ib*. 130.11. *bheṣaje*. In Gāndhārī manuscripts, *raya* (< Skt. *rāja*) occurs frequently.

17. 鳩留先 (536b5; EH. kju lju sen > MC. kjəu ljəu sien; Vkn XII § 15. *Krakucchanda*; BHS. *Krakutsanda*; Pā. *Kakusaṃdha*; Kj. 557a1. 迦羅鳩孫馱; Xz. 587a29. 迦洛迦孫馱)

Jiuliuxian 鳩留先 is probably based on an Indic form such as **Kra'usanna* (< **Krakussanda* < BHS. *Krakutsanda*). *Xian* 先 indicates that OIA -*nd*- had developed into -*ṃn*- in the underlying language in the same way as found in the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* from Khotan and the Gāndhārī documents from Niya.

18. 樓由 (536b6; EH. lou źju > MC. ləu jiəu; Vkn XII § 15. *Roco*; Kj. 557a2. 樓至; Xz. 587b1. 盧至)

Probably, the underlying form of *Louyou* 樓由 was Gā. **Royo* (< *Roco*). The use of the character *you* 由 shows that OIA -*c*- had developed into -*y*- in the underlying language in the same way as in Gāndhārī.[34]

To sum up the features of the underlying language of Zhi Qian's *Weimojie jing*, assumed in the investigations above:

OIA. -*c*- > -*y*-

You 由 (EH. źju > MC. jiəu) of *Louyou* 樓由 (18; Gā. **Royo* < Skt. *Roco*) indicates the development of OIA. -*c*- > Gā. -*y*-.

OIA. -*j*- > -*y*-

Ayiduan 阿夷耑" (6; Gā. **Ayida?* < *Ajita*) and *luoye* 羅耶 (16; Gā. *raya* < Skt. *rāja*) indicate the development of OIA. -*j*- > Gā. -*y*-.

OIA. -*d*- > -*y*-

Ayi 阿夷 (11, 12; **āyi* or **ā'i* < *ādi*) indicates the development of OIA. -*d*- > Gā. -*y*-.

OIA. -*ś*- > -*y*- ?

Shelifu 舍利弗 (BHS. *Śāriputra*; Gā. *Śariputra*), which had been used since Lokakṣema's translations from the Eastern Han Dynasty, and *Bulanjieye* 不蘭迦葉 (4; Gā. *Puraṇo Kaśava*) etc. show that early translators used to transcribe the Indian palatal -*ś*- with Chinese characters, whose initial consonant is palatal *ś*- as well. Then, the character *ye* 耶 (EH. źja > MC. jia) in *Weiyeli* 維耶離 (1; **Veśālī* or **Veyālī?*), *Quyelou* 瞿耶婁 (5; *Gośālo* or **Goyālo?*) and in *Jiye* 基耶 (7; *Keśa* or **Keya?*) indicates that OIA -*ś*- had changed to -*y*- in the underlying language or that the pronunciations of -*ś*- and -*y*- (both palatals) resembled one another.[35]

---

[34] For the development of OIA. -*c*- > Gā. -*y*-, cf. Burrow 1937: § 6; Brough 1962: 86; Fussman 1989: 456f.; Karashima 1994: 17; Salomon 2000: 83; Allon 2001: 81; Lenz 2003: 41; Glass 2007: 115; Salomon 2008: 110f.; Baums 2009: 140f.

[35] For the confusion -*y*- / -*ś*-, see Karashima 1992: 269 § 2.2.7, 289, note on 71a10; von Hinüber 2001: § 213. In Kharoṣṭhī script, the two signs *ya* and *śa* are difficult to distinguish or even look identical at times (cf. Salomon 2000: 68; Lenz 2003: 121f.; Glass 2000: §§ 2.26, 2.30; *ib.* 2007: 100). I assume that -*j*- (> MI., incl. Gā. -*y*-) / -*y*- / -*ś*- were confused because of the similarity of their sounds. This theory may be supported by the Khotanese borrowings from Gāndhārī (cf. von Hinüber 2001: § 213), e.g. *virśa* (< Skt. *vīrya*), *ttärśaśūni* (< Skt. *tiryagyoni*), *neśāya* (< Skt. *niryātayati*) as well as the fact that early Chinese transliterations of these are often identical, e.g. 羅耶 (-*rāja*; T. 15, no. 626, 393a2, translated by Lokakṣema), 摩耶 (*Māyā*; T. 3, no. 184, 462b21, translated by Kang Mengxiang 康孟詳), 維耶離 (*Vaiśālī*; T. 14, no. 474, 519a9, translated by Zhi Qian). Here, I should like to point out also an example,

OIA. *-bh-* > *-vh-* or *-v-*

The character *wei* 維 in *Aweiluoti* 阿維羅提 (15; *Avhiradi* or **Aviradi* < *Abhirati*) indicates the development of OIA. *-bh-* > *-vh-* or *-v-*, which is characteristic of Gāndhārī.[36]

OIA. *-nt-* > *-nd-*

Wentuo 文陀" (13; *Mandā-* < *Mantā-*) indicates the development of OIA. *-nt-* > *-ṃd-*, which is seen also in the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* from Khotan, the Gāndhārī documents from Niya and Gāndhārī loanwords in Khotanese.[37]

OIA. *-nd-* > *-nn-*, OIA. *-mb-* > *-mm-*

Xian 先 (17; **-sann(a)* < *-sanda*) and *jinli* 今離 (7; **-kammala* < *-kambala*) indicate the developments of OIA. *-nd-* > *-nn-* and *-mb-* > *-mm-*, which are common in the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* from Khotan and the Gāndhārī documents from Niya[38], while they occur only rarely in other Gāndhārī manuscripts.

Apart from the transliterations discussed above, *Luolinnajie* 羅鄰那竭 (3; **Ralaṃṇāgara* < **Radaṇāgara* < *Ratanākara* (= Pā) < *Ratnākara*), *Bannouwentuoni* 頒耨文陀尼 (13; *Puṇṇo *Mandānī-* < Pā. *Puṇṇo* [*Puṇṇa~*] *Mantānī-*) *etc.* also indicate that the underlying language of Zhi Qian's *Weimojie jing* was not Sanskrit but Prakrit, most probably Gāndhārī.

As Lokakṣema's *Daoxing Banre jing* (179 C.E.) contains as many as 182 transliterations[39], we are able to know the features of its underlying Indic language and deduce that the language was Gāndhārī.[40] Compared with Lokakṣema's translation, as Zhi Qian's *Weimojie jing* in question contains very few transliterations, it is difficult to know the features of its underlying Indic language. Nonetheless, the eighteen transliterations discussed above, show that its underlying Indic language was most probably Gāndhārī.

III Analysis of Translated Words

As I have demonstrated elsewhere[41], we can deduce from Zhi Qian's translated words that he confused colloquial forms (i.e. Prakrit) with Sanskrit. For example, in his

---

illustrating this confusion from Lokakṣema's translation of the *Prajñāpāramitā* (T. 8, no. 224; 179 C.E.). In the following sentence, he apparently confused *rāśi~* ("heap") with *rājan* ("king"). Also, he mistook *śuddha~* ("pure") for either *yuddha* ("battle, war") or *yudh* ("warrior, fighter"): T. 8, no. 224, 446a2f. 般若波羅蜜者，甚深，珍寶中王。天中天！般若波羅蜜者，大將中王。天中天！般若波羅蜜，與空共鬭，無能勝者 ("The *Prajñāpāramitā* is profound, it is the king of the precious treasures. The *Prajñāpāramitā* is, O Lord, the king of generals. The *Prajñāpāramitā*, O Lord, fights with the sky and none defeats it.") / AS. 109.27f. = AAA. 479.5f. *ratnarāśir bhagavan! prajñāpāramitā śuddharāśir bhagavan! prajñāpāramitā ākāśaśuddhatām upādāya* ("The *Prajñāpāramitā* is, O Lord, a heap of treasure. The *Prajñāpāramitā* is, O Lord, a pure heap, based upon purity [like] space.").

[36.] Brough 1962: §§ 12, 44; von Hinüber 2001: 191; Baums 2009: 145f.

[37.] Cf. Karashima 1994: 34, 71–72 (note 109); *ib.* 2013: 177; *ib.* 2014: 459.

[38.] Cf. Burrow 1937: § 45; Brough 1962: §§ 46, 47; Karashima 1994: 34f.; *ib.* 2013: 177 (*-ṇḍ-* > *-ṇṇ-*); *ib.* 2014: 459.

[39.] Cf. Krsh 2010: 749–756.

[40.] Cf. Karashima 2013; *ib.* 2014.

[41.] Karashima 1997a: 169; *ib.* 2006: 363 = *ib.* 2007: 299–300; *ib.* 2010a: 16ff. Cf. also Nattier 2007: 369, 2009: 108f.

translation of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, namely the *Da Mingdu jing* 大明度經 (T. 8, no. 225), the word *shui* 水 ("water") corresponds to *ābhā* ("light, splendour") in the Sanskrit version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, e.g. *Shuixing tian* 水行天 (485a12; Skt. *Ābhā*), *Wuliangshui tian* 無量水天 (485a12; BHS. *Apramāṇābhā*), *Shuiyin tian* 水音天 (485a12; BHS. *Ābhāsvara*) *etc.* These translated words, showing that Zhi Qian confused Skt. *ābhā* ("light, splendour"; > Gā. *ava*) with Gā. **ava* (< Skt. *āpas* "water"; cf. Pā. *āpa*, *āpo* "water"), make us assume that the underlying Indian text had been transmitted in Gāndhārī, where the word *ava* could be interpreted as both "light, splendour" and "water".

If we analyse his misinterpretations carefully — in other words, discrepancies between his translated words and the Sanskrit version —, we can use them as clues so as to know the features of the underlying languages of his translations. In the following, I shall pick out such instances from his *Weimojie jing* (T. 14, no. 474).[42]

1. ***deva / dīva* (< OIA. *dīpa*)**: *Dengwang* 燈王 (519b12; "Lamp-King") in the *Weimojie jing* corresponds to *Devarāja* in the Sanskrit version (Vkn I § 4), which indicates that Zhi Qian confused OIA *deva* ("heaven") with MI. *dīva*, Gā. *diva* (< OIA. *dīpa* "lamp").

2. ***jālin / jala***: *Shui* 水 ("water") in the *Weimojie jing* sometimes corresponds to *jālin* ("having a net"), e.g. *Dishui* 帝(←寶)水 (519b11; Vkn I § 4. *Indrajālin*), *Shuiguang* 水光 (*do. Jālinīprabha*), *Fanshui* 梵水 (519b16; Vkn I § 4. *Brahmajālin*), all of which indicate that Zhi Qian understood *jālin*, which is a derivative of *jāla* ("net"), mistakenly as a derivative of OIA. *jala* ("water").

The following three instances of mistranslations show that Zhi Qian confused the long vowels with short ones.

3. ***bāhu / bahu***: *Shanduo* 善多 (531a8; "Good-Many") in the *Weimojie jing* corresponds to *Subāhu* (Vkn VIII § 5; Kj. 妙臂; Xz. 妙臂), which indicates that Zhi Qian confused OIA. *bāhu* ("arm") with *bahu* ("many, much").

4. ***Nārāyaṇa / nara + yāna***: *Rensheng* 人乘 (531a25; "Human-Vehicle") in the *Weimojie jing* corresponds to *Nārāyaṇa* (Vkn VIII § 12; Kj. 那羅延; Xz. 那羅延), which indicates that Zhi Qian interpreted this very popular name as being OIA. *nara* ("man") plus OIA. *yāna* ("vehicle").

5. ***dhura / dūra***: *Buzhiyuan* 不置遠 (519b15; "Not-Place-in-the-Distance") in the *Weimojie jing* corresponds to the *bodhisatva*'s name *Anikṣiptadhura* (Vkn I § 4; Pā. *Anikhittadhura*), which indicates that Zhi Qian confused OIA. *dhura*

[42.] The following analysis was made by me as early as September 2003, based on a list of the names of *bodhisatva*s in the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese versions of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, entitled "Yuimakyō tekisuto kō —— Bon–Zō-Kan wo tooshite" 維摩経テキスト考——梵・蔵・漢対照をとおして —— [On the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* through a comparative study of its Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese versions], delivered by Dr. Kōshin Suzuki 鈴木晃信 of Taishō University on the occasion of the 54th Annual Conference of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies, Bukkyō University, September 2003. Much earlier, I had analysed several of the same Chinese names found in Dharmarakṣa's translation of the Lotus Sutra, i.e. the *Zheng Fahua jing* 正法華經 (T. 9, no. 263), in my work (Karashima 1992). Cf. also Nattier 2007: 369.

("burden") with *dūra* ("distant").[43]

The last instance shows that Zhi Qian confused *dh* and *d* as well.

6. ***Somacchatra / Sunakṣatra***: *Shanxiu* 善宿 (535c20, 24, 536a20, 25, 29, b3; "Good-Constellation") in the *Weimojie jing* corresponds to *Somacchatra* (Vkn XII §§ 9, 13, 14, 15; Kj. 556b12ff. 月蓋, Xz. 586b16ff. 月蓋), which indicates that Zhi Qian understood *Somacchatra* as OIA. *su* ("good") + *nakṣatra* ("constellation")[44], and also that, in his time, the pronunciations of *kṣ* and *cch* were similar[45]. In the Gāndhārī documents from Niya, we find a colloquial form *nachatra* (< OIA. *nakṣatra* "constellation")[46], which supports my assumption above that Zhi Qian interpreted *Somacchatra* awkwardly as *su* + *nakṣatra* and translated it as *Shanxiu* ("Good-Constellation").

7. *-ś- / -y-*:

In the *Weimojie jing*, *jing* 淨 and *qing* 清, both meaning "pure, clean", often correspond to OIA. *vyūha* ("arrangement")[47], e.g.:

Guangjing 光淨 (519b6; Vkn I § 4. *Prabhāvyūha*; Kj. 光嚴; Xz. 光嚴)

Dajing 大淨 (519b7; Vkn I § 4. *Mahāvyūha*; Kj. 大嚴; Xz. 大嚴)

Lianhuajing 蓮華淨 (519b16; Vkn I § 4. *Padmavyūha*; Kj. 華嚴; Xz. 蓮華嚴)

Jingfujing 淨復淨 (522c27; Vkn III § 29. *Śubhavyūha*; Kj. 嚴淨; Xz. 嚴淨)

Baojing 寶淨 (529a7; Vkn VI § 13, 44a3. *Ratnavyūha*; Kj. 寶嚴; Xz. 寶嚴)

Daqing 大(←太)清 (535c12; Vkn XII § 7. *Mahāvyūha*; Kj. 大莊嚴; Xz. 大嚴)

Moreover, in some places in his translation, *jing* 淨 ("pure, clean") corresponds to *āyūha* ("effort, striving"[48]) in the Sanskrit version, while *bujing* 不淨 and *hui* 穢, both meaning "impure, unclean", correspond to *niryūha* ("abandonment, withdrawal"[49]), e.g.:

ZQ. 524a15f. 無我(←色)哉佛，淨穢已離。順哉佛，本性已清。明哉佛，自然已淨 (Vkn III § 52, 21b4. *nirātmikā bodhir āyūhaniryūhavigatā, anākulā bodhiḥ prakṛtipariśuddhā, prakāśā bodhiḥ svabhāvapariśuddhā*; Kj. 542c4f. 如化是菩提無取捨故。無亂是菩提常自靜故。善寂是菩提性清淨故)

[43.] Cf. Karashima 1992: 27, s.v. 63a-2. "不置遠". When I wrote this monograph on Dharmarakṣa's translation of the Lotus Sutra (286 C.E.) a quarter of a century ago, I thought that this expression had been coined by Dharmarakṣa. However, now, it is clear that he just borrowed it from Zhi Qian's vocabulary corpus.

[44.] In another place in Zhi Qian's *Weimojie jing*, *Shanxiu* 善宿 (531a6; "Good-Constellation") corresponds to *Sunakṣatra* (Vkn VIII § 4. *Sunakṣatra*; Kj. 550c13. 善宿; Xz. 577b1. 妙星).

[45.] Bailey thought that the Gāndhārī *kṣ* was pronounced as [ṭṣ] (Bailey 1946: 770ff.; cf. Brough 1962: 72). If his assumption is correct, its sound was very similar to that of *cch*. In fact, OIA. *chatra* is written as *kṣatra* in a Gāndhārī manuscript (Salomon 2008: 111, 428) and in various manuscripts of Central Asian languages: e.g. Khotanese *kṣat(t)ra*, Tocharian *kṣāt(t)re*, *kuṣāt(t)re*. Moreover, in an old Sanskrit fragment of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsasūtra* from Central Asia, *chatra* is written as *kṣatra* (Jiang / Karashima 2003, p. 343, n. 118; cf. Karashima 2008: 148). Apart from OIA. *chatra*, OIA. *kukṣi* is written as *kuchi* in a Gāndhārī manuscript (Salomon 2008: 124). Cf. Baums 2009: 168–169.

[46.] NiDoc 207, no. 565.

[47.] Inagaki has already pointed this out (1998: 213, 217). Cf. also Karashima 2010: 18ff.

[48.] Cf. BHSD, s.v. *āyūha*.

[49.] Cf. BHSD, s.v. *niryūha*.

ZQ. 527a6f. 法無不淨在不淨者，於法有取有放。斯求法者，無取放之求也 (Vkn V § 3, 34a6. *dharmo nâyūho niryūhaḥ. ye kecid dharmaṃ gṛhṇanti vā muñcanti vā, na te dharmārthikā, udgrahaniḥsargārthikās te*; Kj. 546a18f. 法無取捨。若取捨法，是則取捨非求法也)

The colloquial form *viyūha* of OIA. *vyūha* is attested in some old Buddhist manuscripts from Central Asia.[50] Probably, Zhi Qian understood -*yūha* in *viyūha* (< *vyūha*), *ā-yūha* and *nir-yūha* as coming from **śuha* (<[51] *śubha* "splendid, beautiful; pleasant")[52], and, thus, translated *viyūha* and *āyūha* — their colloquial forms must have stood in the underlying text — as *jing* 淨 ("pure"), while rendering *niryūha* ("without *yūha*") as *bujing* 不淨 and *hui* 穢, both meaning "impure", on the basis of his understanding *niryūha* as "without *śuha*", i.e. "without purity".

The many examples of the peculiar interpretation of **yūha* / **śuha*, quoted above, tell us that -*y*- and -*ś*- were pronounced in similar ways in the underlying language of Zhi Qian's translation.

8. ***saṃghāta* / *saṃkhāta* (< *saṃkhyāta*)**: *Fashu* 法數 (526a15; "*dharma*-number") in the *Weimojie jing* corresponds to *dharma-saṃghāta* (Vkn IV § 11; Kj. 545a3f. 以衆法合成, Xz. 568b26f. 衆法和合共成), which shows that Zhi Qian confused *saṃghāta* ("combined; accumulation, aggregate") with MI. *saṃkhāta* (Gā. *sakhada*; < OIA. *saṃkhāta* "enumerated"). This indicates that -*gh*- and -*kh*- were pronounced similarly in the underlying language of his translation.

9. ***saṃskṛta > saṃkhata* / *saṃkhāta* (< *saṃkhyāta*)**: *Shu* 數 (533c22, 533c23, 534a15, 534a26–b11, 534b17; "number"), *wubushu* 無不數 (534b28; "not unenumerated"), *wushu* 無數(531b26, 533c22, 534a15, 534a25, 534a26–b12, 534b28; "innumerable"), *wuyoushu* 無有數 (531b26; "innumerable"), *wujishu* 無計數 (523a4; "incalculable") in the *Weimojie jing* correspond to *saṃskṛta* ("conditioned"; Vkn VIII § 22, X § 16, § 17, § 19, XI § 1; Kj = Xz. 有為 "conditioned") and *asaṃskṛta* ("unconditioned"; Vkn III § 30, VIII § 22, X § 16, § 18, § 19, XI § 1; Kj = Xz. 無為 "unconditioned").[53] These instances indicate that Zhi Qian confused MI. *saṃkhata* (Gā. *sakhada*; < OIA. *saṃskṛta*) and MI.

---

[50] SP(KN) 101.2. -*vyūha*~ / SP(O), SP(Wi) 48. *viyūha*~; SP(KN) 460.7. -*vyūho* / SP(Wi) 121. *viyūho*; Sukh(SC) 208.10, 213.11. *viyūhā*.

[51] Cf. Pkt. *suha* < Skt. *śubha*. In Lokakṣema's translation of the *Prajñāpāramitā* (T. 8, no. 224; 179 C.E.), we find the following transliterations, which indicate the development of **śuha* < OIA. *śubha* in its underlying Indian text: 首呵 (435a12; **Śuha* < *Śubhā*), 波慄多修呵 (435a13; **Parittaśuha* < *Parīttaśubha*), 首呵迦 (439c25; **Śuhaka-* < *Śubhakṛtsna*), 阿波摩首呵 (439c24; **Apamā(ṇa)śuha* < *Apramāṇaśubha*). Cf. Karashima 2006: 357; Nattier 2006: 192; Karashima 2013: 175; *do.* 2014: 457.

[52] Cf. Nattier 2007: 376f., Karashima 2010: 20f.

[53] The following instance is rather interesting: ZQ. 531a22. 此有數，此無數；Kj. 551a1. 有為、無為; Xz. 577b25. 有為、無為; Vkn VIII § 11. *idaṃ sukhaṃ idam asukham* (= Tibetan translation: *'di ni bde ba, 'di ni mi bde ba'o*). All the Chinese translations show that their underlying Indian texts had read **idaṃ saṃskṛtam idam asaṃskṛtam* or **idaṃ saṃkhatam idam asaṃkhatam* in the vernacular form, where the latter form may have been sanskritised mistakenly to *idaṃ sukhaṃ idam asukham* as it stands in the present Sanskrit version.

saṃkhāta (Gā. *sakhada*; < OIA. *saṃkhyāta* "enumerated").[54]

10. **śrī > śirī / śira**: *Shou* 首 ("head") in the *Weimojie jing* corresponds to *śrī* ("splendour, glory; auspicious") in several places: *Baoshou* 寶首 (519b10, 529a7; Vkn I § 4, VI § 13. 44a2–3. *Ratna-śrī*; Kj. 537b7. 寶勇, 548b15. 寶德; Xz. 558a13. 寶吉祥, 574b9. 寶勝), *Rushou* 濡首 (519b18; Vkn I § 4. *Mañju-śrī*; Kj. 537b15. 文殊師利; Xz. 558a22f. 妙吉祥), *Shoubi* 首閉 (530c28; Vkn VIII § 2. *Śrī-gupta*; Kj. 550c5. 德守; Xz. 577a19. 勝密), *Shouli* 首立 (531a3; Vkn VIII § 3. *Śrī-kūṭa*; Kj. 551a3. 德頂; Xz. 577a26. 勝峰), *Shouhuai* 首懷 (531c11; Vkn VIII § 27. *Śrī-garbha*; Kj. 551b28. 德藏; Xz. 578b18. 勝藏). These instances indicate that Zhi Qian confused the vernacular forms *śirī*[55], *śiri* (= Gā; OIA. *śrī*) with OIA. *śiras* ("head").[56] Most probably, in the underlying Indian text of the *Weimojie jing*, the vernacular form *śirī* or *śiri* had stood, which was later sanskritised to *śrī*.

11. **maṇḍa > *maṇa / maṇa (< manas)**: In the Sanskrit version of the text in question, there is the following story (Vkn III § 54): One day, as Prabhāvyūha, a disciple of the Buddha was about to leave Vaiśālī, he saw the householder Vimalakīrti entering the city. When Prabhāvyūha asked him from where he had come, he replied that he had come from *bodhimaṇḍa*. Thereupon, Prabhāvyūha asked him what *bodhimaṇḍa* was.

Zhi Qian rendered *bodhimaṇḍa* ("*platform* or *terrace* or *seat of enlightenment*, name given to the spot under the bodhitree on which the Buddha sat when he became enlightened")[57] as *daochang* 道場 (524a24f.; "place of enlightenment"), which was used by Kumārajīva (542c14) as well, while Xuanzang translated it as *miao puti* 妙菩提 ("wonderful *bodhi*"; 565b10f.).

In Vkn III §§ 55–59, replying to the above-quoted question from Prabhāvyūha, Vimalakīrti explained *bodhimaṇḍa* concretely by listing 33 "synonyms" of *bodhimaṇḍa*, such as *āśaya-maṇḍa*, *bodhicitta-maṇḍa*, *dāna-maṇḍa*, *śīla-maṇḍa*, *kṣānti-maṇḍa*, *prajñā-maṇḍa*, *maitrī-maṇḍa*, *sarvaMāranirghātanamaṇḍa etc.* Where the Sanskrit manuscript reads *maṇḍa*, Kumārajīva's translation has *daochang* 道場 ("place of enlightenment"; Kj. 542c15–543a4) and Xuanzang rendered every word as *miao puti* 妙菩提 ("wonderful *bodhi*"; Xz. 565b12–c13).

However, strangely enough, in Zhi Qian's translation (524a26–b12), *xin* 心 ("the mind") is used the most (26 times out of 33) in places corresponding to *maṇḍa* in the Sanskrit version, e.g. *wusheng zhi xin* 無生之心, *daoyi zhi xin* 道

---

54. In a similar way, *wushu* 無數 (534a16, 17; "innumerable") corresponds to *anabhisaṃskāra* in the Sanskrit version (Vkn X § 18; Kj = Xz. 無作), which is difficult to explain. I assume that the vernacular form *-saṃkhāra* of OIA. *-saṃskāra* was confused with *saṃkhāta* (< OIA. *saṃkhyāta* "enumerated").

55. Cf. Pā, Pkt. *sirī*; BHS. *śirī* (BHSG § 3.108); EHS. *śirī* (Damsteegt 1978: 78). Whereas the Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* from Nepal read *Mañjuśrī*, those from Gilgit and Central Asia read *Mañjuśirī* (Cf. Karashima 1992: 277).

56. Cf. Karashima 1992: 27 (63a-3. 溥首 *Mañjuśrī*), 38 (66b10. 首藏 *Śrīgarbha*), 216 (125a-11. 離垢日月光首 *Candrasūryavimalaprabhāśrī*), 226 (128a10. 蓮華首 *Padmaśrī*), 277.

57. BHSD, s.v.

意之心, *bushi zhi xin* 布施之心, *chijie zhi xin* 持戒之心, *renru zhi xin* 忍辱之心, *zhihui zhi xin* 智慧之心, *cixin* 慈心, *fu zhumoxin* 伏諸魔心 *etc.*, while, in the final four occurrences of the long list of "synonyms" of *bodhimaṇḍa*, *chang* 場 ("place") stands instead of *xin* 心, namely *sanjie zhi chang* 三界之場, *shizizuo chang* 師子座場, *liwuwei chang* 力無畏場, *yiyijue chang* 一意覺場 (ZQ. 524b12–15).

The last sentence of the detailed answer from Vimalakīrti reads as follows: "*Bodhisatva*s, who (proceed by) moving (their) legs up and down which are connected to the (six) *pāramitā*s, to the ripening of sentient beings, to the mastering of the righteous teachings, to the roots of merit, all come from *bodhimaṇḍa*, come from the Buddha's Teaching and stay in the Buddha's Teaching." (Vkn III § 60). In Zhi Qian's translation, *foxin* 佛心 (524b17; "mind of the Buddha" or "mind of enlightenment") stands here, which parallels *bodhimaṇḍa* (Kj. 543a7. 道場; Xz. 565c18. 妙菩提) in this sentence. Why on earth, then, did Zhi Qian render *maṇḍa* ("the best, supreme point") as *xin* 心 ("mind")? As this Chinese character means "the centre, most important part" as well, one cannot exclude the possibility that he translated *maṇḍa* as *xin* 心 with this specific meaning in mind. However, the following assumption is more probable: in the underlying text of his translation, instead of OIA. *maṇḍa*, its Gāndhārī form **maṇṇa* (written as **maṇa*)[58] had stood in the above-cited sentences, while OIA. *manas*, meaning "mind, thought", also became *maṇa*, *maṇo* in Gāndhārī. Zhi Qian, then, understood the form **maṇa* to mean both "the best, supreme point" (OIA. *maṇḍa*) and "mind" (OIA. *manas*) and so translated *chang* 場 ("place") as well as *xin* 心 ("mind").

12. ***pratyeka-buddha > pracea-budha***: *Yuanyijue* 緣一覺 (528c18, 21, 24 *etc.*; "one, who perceives causation and oneness") in the *Weimojie jing* corresponds constantly to BHS. *pratyeka-buddha* (Pā. *pacceka-buddha*; "independent buddha"[59]).[60] Why did Zhi Qian render such a common word in this peculiar way? If his underlying Indian text had read *pratyeka-buddha*, he should have rendered it as *dujue* 獨覺 ("one, who is enlightened by oneself"). I assume that his underlying Indian text had read *pracea-budha*, an attested Gāndhārī form of *pratyeka-buddha*[61], of which *pracea* might have been understood by Zhi Qian as meaning both "single, by oneself" (< *pratyeka*) and "cause" (*pratyaya*)[62] and so

---

[58] The development of *-ṇḍ- > -ṇṇ-* is common in the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* from Khotan and the Gāndhārī documents from Niya; cf. Burrow 1937: § 45; Burrow 1962: § 45; Karashima 2013: 177; Karashima 2014: 459. In the first half of this present article, I pointed out that similar developments of OIA. *-nd- > -nn-* and OIA. *-mb- > -mm-* are to be assumed in the underlying language of Zhi Qian's translation in question.

[59] Norman (1991: 233–249; 2006: 134f.) assumes that Pā. *paccekabuddha* is a hyper-form of **pacceya-buddha* ("one, who is awakened by *pratyaya*"), which I doubt.

[60] E.g. Vkn VI § 11, § 12 etc. *pratyekabuddha*; ZQ. 緣一覺; Kj. 辟支佛; Xz. 獨覺.

[61] The form *pracea-budha* is attested in the Gāndhārī version of the *Anavatapta-gāthā* (Salomon 2008: 173). The same form appears also in a Gāndhārī *Mahāyāna* manuscript (unidentified): Nasim Khan 50.24f. *praceabudhayaṇeṇa ... praceabudhayaṇi*; *ibid.* 54.5f. *praceabudhadharma ... praceabudha ... praceabudhayaṇio*. Cf. Gā. *praceka-buddha*, *pracega-buddha* (< BHS. *pratyeka-buddha*).

[62] Cf. Gā. *pracea* < OIA. *pratyaya*; e.g. Nasim Khan 75.21, 25. *ya hedu ya pracea.*

he rendered it as *yuanyijue* 緣一覺 ("one, who perceives causation and oneness") by mixing the two meanings together. I assume, further, that such an interpretation of this term had been made in Gandhāra and therefore, Zhi Qian adopted it. Only in the Gāndhārī form *pracea-budha*, is it possible to relate *pratyeka-buddha* with *pratyaya*. In the Sanskrit version of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, we find such an interpretation[63]: Vkn VI § 11 *pratyekabuddhayānikâsmi pratītyadharmāvatareṇa* ("Because of the comprehending conditionality of *dharma*s, I am one of those, who are enlightened by themselves."; ZQ. 528c18f. 緣一覺行, 眼見道意; Kj. 548a23f. 以因緣法化眾生故, 我為辟支佛; Xz. 574a7f. 我為化度求獨覺乘諸有情故, 我為獨覺). As such an understanding of this term is only intelligible with the Gāndhārī form *pracea-budha*, the sentence, quoted above, indicates that this text was composed in Gandhāra.

Amongst the 12 instances of the mistranslations, investigated above, in Zhi Qian's *Weimojie jing* or its discrepancies with the other versions, nos. 9–12 can be explained away by assuming that the underlying text had read *saṃkhata* (Gā. *saghada*), *śirī*, **maṇa* and *praceabudha*, respectively, all of which are colloquial or more specifically, Gāndhārī forms. These instances show that the underlying language of the *Weimojie jing* was Gāndhārī.

IV Conclusion

As I have demonstrated elsewhere[64], Zhi Qian's Chinese translation of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, namely the *Da Mingdu jing* 大明度經 (T. 8, no. 225), is none other than a "modified version" of Lokakṣema's oldest translation, namely the *Daoxing Banre jing* 道行般若經 (T. 8, no. 224). Zhi Qian seems to have only consulted the original text occasionally, while in most cases, he "sinicised" Lokakṣema's word-for-word, very literal and rudimentary translation, by replacing vernacular expressions and transliterations within it with elegant and refined Chinese expressions. A similar relationship is also to be seen in Lokakṣema's translation of the *Amitābha-sūtra*, aka *Sukhāvatīvyūha*, namely the *Da Amituo jing* 大阿彌陀經 (T. 12, no. 362) and Zhi Qian's *Wuliang Qingjing Pingdengjue jing* 無量清淨平等覺經 (T. 12, no. 361).[65] I assume, therefore, Zhi Qian's *Weimojie jing* is probably a modified version of the oldest translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* by Yan Fotiao 嚴佛調 of the Eastern Han Dynasty, which is reported to have been similarly entitled the *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經 (now lost).[66] Zhi Qian might have modified Yan Fotiao's translation a great deal and the

---

[63.] A similar explanation of the term *pratyeka-buddha* is found in the Lotus Sutra and other *Mahāyāna* scriptures as well. I am preparing an article on this topic at present.

[64] Cf. Karashima 2011, 2014a.

[65.] Cf. Karashima 2010a: 28, 32f.

[66.] Fei Changfang (費長房)'s *Lidai Sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 (597? C.E.; T. 49, no. 2034, p. 34, l. 9; 54a15f., 57a22f.), Daoxuan (道宣)'s *DaTang Neidianlu* 大唐內典錄 (664 C.E.; T. 55, no. 2149, 224c5f.), Zhisheng (智昇)'s *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (730 C.E.; T. 55, no. 2154, 483a14, 429a5) all refer to Yan Fotiao's *Gu Weimojie jing* 古維摩詰經 ("The Older *Vimalakīrti* Scripture") as being lost. As this translation is not referred to in earlier catalogues or texts, its existence has been doubted by some scholars (e.g. Lamotte 1994: xci), though I assume that it had existed at one point or other. Fei Changfang writes in his *Lidai Sanbao ji* as follows: "*Weimojie Suoshuo Busiyi Famen jing*, alias *Foshuo Puru Daomen jing*. (It

transliterations found in Zhi Qian's *Weimojie jing*, are probably borrowings from that translation, while most of the Chinese expressions were made anew by Zhi Qian himself.

Zhi Qian's *Weimojie jing* does not contain many transliterations. Moreover, the original Indian forms assumed, based on the translated words, are not completely reliable. Therefore, we are far from being able to describe the overall features of the underlying Indic language of this Chinese translation. However, we can assume at least that the language was not Sanskrit but Gāndhārī or another vernacular language, containing Gāndhārī elements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGNS

AAA = *Abhisamayālaṃkār'ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā: The Work of Haribhadra*, together with the text commented on, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932: The Toyo Bunko; repr.: Tokyo [2]1973: Sankibō Busshorin.

Akanuma = Chizen Akanuma 赤沼智善, *Indo-bukkyō Koyū-meishi Jiten* 印度佛教固有名詞辭典 [Dictionary of Indian Buddhist Proper Names], Nagoya 1931: Hajinkaku Shobō 破塵閣書房; repr.: [2]1967: Hōzōkan 法蔵館.

Allon, Mark

2001 *Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-Type Sūtras: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 12 and 14*, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 2).

ARIRIAB = *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*

AS = *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā with Haribhadra's Commentary called Āloka*, ed. P.L. Vaidya, Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1960 (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 4).

Bailey, Harold Walter

1946 "Gāndhārī", in: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11, pp. 764–797.

Baums, Stefan

2009 *A Gāndhārī Commentary on Early Buddhist Verses: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 7, 9, 13 and 18*, PhD. Diss. University of Washington. (http://gandhari.org/baums/tmp/baums_2009.pdf).

BHS = a Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit word, listed in BHSD

BHSG, BHSD = Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols., New Haven 1953: Yale University Press; repr. Delhi, [2]1970: Motilal Banarsidass.

Brough, John

1962 *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London 1962: Oxford University Press (*London Oriental Series*, vol. 7).

Burrow, Thomas

consists of) three or two *juan*s. This is the second translation, which differs slightly from the translation, made by Yan Fotiao of the Later Han. It is referred to in Zhu Daozu's *WeiWu lu* [Catalogue of the Wei and Wu Dynasties] and the *Sanzang ji* [Colophons of the *Tripiṭaka*]" (《維摩詰所説不思議法門經》三卷。亦云《佛説普入道門經》。或二卷。第二出。與後漢嚴佛調譯者小異。見竺道祖《魏呉錄》及《三藏記》). This describes explicitly that Zhi Qian's translation is a modification of Yan Fotiao's.

1937　*The Language of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, Cambridge: The University Press.

Coblin, W. South

1983　*A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses*, Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

1994　*A Compendium of Phonetics in Northwest Chinese*, Journal of Chinese Linguistics Monograph Series Number 7, Berkeley.

Damsteegt, Theo

1978　*Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit: Its Rise, Spread, Characteristics and Relationship to Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit*, Leiden: Brill (Orientalia Rheno-traiectina 23).

DPPN = *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, by G.P. Malalasekera, 2 vols., London ¹1937–1938; London ²1960: The Pali Text Society.

EH = reconstructions of the Eastern Han (25–220 C.E.) Chinese sound system, posited by Coblin (1983).

EHS = Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit see Damsteegt 1978

Falk, Harry

2011　"The 'Split' Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Texts", ARIRIAB 14: 13–23.

Fussman, Gérard

1989　"Gāndhārī écrite, Gāndhārī parlée", in: *Dialectes dans les Littératures Indo-Aryennes*, éd. par Colette Caillat, Paris: Collège de France, Institut de Civilisation Indienne, pp. 433–501.

Gā = Gāndhārī

Glass, Andrew

2000　"A Preliminary Study of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscript Paleography", MA thesis. Department of Asian Languages and Literature, University of Washington.

2007　*Four Gāndhārī Saṃyuktāgama Sūtras: Senior Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5*, Seattle: University of Washington Press (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 4).

Hinüber, Oskar von

2001　*Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, 2., erweiterte Auflage, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (SbÖAW Bd. 467 = Veröffentlichung der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 20).

Inagaki, Hisao

1998　*Nāgārjuna's Discourse on the Ten Stages (Daśabhūmika-vibhāṣā) : A Study and Translation from Chinese of Verses and Chapter 9*, Kyoto: Ryukoku University, Ryukoku Gakkai (Ryukoku Literature Series V).

Jiang, Zhongxin and Seishi Karashima

2003　"Sanskrit Fragments of the Sutra of Golden Light from the Lüshun Museum Collection", in: 華林, vol. 3 (2003), 北京: 中華書局, pp. 331–381.

Karashima, Seishi

1992　*The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra—— in the light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*, Tokyo 1992: Sankibō Busshorin (Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 3).

1994　*Jō-agonkyō no Gengo no Kenkyū — Onshago Bunseki wo Chūshin tosite* (「長阿含経」の原語の研究——音写語分析を中心として）[A Study of the Underlying Language of the Chinese *Dīrghāgama*——Focusing on an Analysis of the Transliterations], Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppansha 平河出版社.

1997　"Hanyi Fodian de Yuyan Yanjiu" 漢譯佛典的語言研究　附篇：　佛典漢語三題 ——關于語氣詞"婆"、關于貝多、關于罽賓 [A Study of the Language and Transliterations of the Chinese Buddhist Translations; Additional Notes on "*po*",

"*beido*" and "*Jibin*"] in: *Suyuyan Yanjiu* 俗語言研究 [Studies on the Chinese Vernacular Language], 4: 29–49.

1997a "Shoki Daijō Butten no Bunkengakuteki Kenkyū eno Atarashii Shiten" 初期大乗仏典の文献学的研究への新しい視点 [Some New Viewpoints on Philological Studies of Early Mahāyāna Texts], in: *Buddhist Studies* (Bukkyō Kenkyū), vol. 26: 157–176.

2006 *Chang Ahan jing Yuanyu Yanjiu* 《長阿含經》原語研究 [A Study of the Underlying Language of the Chinese *Dīrghāgama*], translated by He Keqing 賀可慶, in: *Zhengguan Zazhi* 正觀雜誌, vol. 38, Taiwan: Zhengguan Zazhi she 正観觀雜社, pp. 115–136.

2006 "Underlying Languages of Early Chinese Translations of Buddhist Scriptures", in: *Studies in Chinese Language and Culture: Festschrift in Honour of Christoph Harbsmeier on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, ed. by Christoph Anderl and Halvor Eifring, Oslo 2006, Hermes Academic Publishing, pp. 355–366.

2007 "Zaoqi Hanyi Fojiao Jingdian suo yiju de Yuyan" 早期漢譯佛教經典所依據的語言 [Underlying Languages of Early Chinese Translations of Buddhist Scriptures], translated by Xu Wenkan 徐文堪, in: *Hanyushi Yanjiu Jikan* 漢語史研究集刊 [Studies on the History of Chinese Language], vol. 10, Chendu 成都: Bashu Shushe 巴蜀書社, pp. 293–305.

2008 "Hanyi Fodian de Yuyan Yanjiu (3)" 漢譯佛典的語言研究 (三) [A Study of the Language of the Chinese Buddhist Translations (3)], in: *Yuyanxue Luncong* 語言學論叢 [Studies in Linguistics], vol. 37, Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan 商務印書館, pp. 144–168.

2009 "Hanyi Fodian de Yuyan Yanjiu" 漢譯佛典的語言研究 [A Study of the Language of the Chinese Buddhist Translations], in: *Fojiao Hanyu Yanjiu* 佛教漢語研究, ed. by Zhu Qingzhi 朱慶之, Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan 商務印書館, pp. 33–74.

2010 "Hanyi Fodian de Yuyan Yanjiu" 漢譯佛典的語言研究 [A Study of the Language of the Chinese Buddhist Translations], in: *Hanyushi zhong de Yuyanjiechuwenti Yanjiu* 漢語史中的語言接觸問題研究, ed. by Yu Xiaorong 遇笑容, Cao Guangshun 曹廣順 and Zu Shengli 祖生利, Beijing: Yuyan Chubanshe 語文出版社, pp. 133–153.

2010a "Amida jōdo no Genfūkei" 阿弥陀浄土の原風景 [The original landscape of Amitābha's "Pure Land"], in: *Bukkyū Daigaku Sōgōkenkyūjo Kiyō* 佛教大学総合研究所紀要 [Bulletin of the Research Institute of Bukkyo University], vol. 17 (2010), pp. 15–44.

2011 "Li-yung "fan-pan" yen-chiu chung-ku han-yü yen-pien : i *Tao-hsing Pan-jo Ching* "i-i" yü *Chiu-se-lu Ching* wei li" 利用「翻版」研究中古漢語演變：以《道行般若經》「異譯」與《九色鹿經》為例 [A Study of the Evolution of Middle Chinese Using "Modified Versions": Case Studies of the *Tao-hsing Pan-jo Ching* and Its Later Modifications and the *Chiu-se-lu Ching*], in: Chung-cheng Ta-hsüeh Chung-wen Hsüeh-shu Nien-k'an 中正大學中文學術年刊, no. 18 (2011): 165–188.

2013 "Was the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Compiled in Gandhāra in Gāndhārī?", in: ARIRIAB 16(2013): 171–188.

2014 "Daijōbukkyō to Gandhāra —— *Banrejing*, Amituo, Guanyin" 大乗仏教とガンダーラ——般若経・阿弥陀・観音 —— [Mahāyāna Buddhism and Gandhāra —— On the *Prajñāpāramitā, Amitābha and Avalokitasvara*"], ARIRIAB 17(2014): 449–485.

2014a "Shoki kan-yaku butten no gengo no kenkyū — Shirukasen yaku to Shiken yaku no taihiwo chūshin toshite" 初期漢訳仏典の言語の研究—支婁迦識訳と支謙訳の対比を中心として— [A Study of the Language of the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations: Comparison between the translations by Lokakṣema and those by Zhi

Qian], in: *Okuda Seiō Sensei Shōju Kinen Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Ronjū* 奥田聖應先生頌寿記念 インド学仏教学論集: Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppansha 佼成出版社, pp.890–909.

2015　"Who Composed the Mahāyāna Scriptures?—— The Mahāsāṃghikas and *Vaitulya* Scriptures", in: ARIRIAB 18: 113–162.

Kj = Kumārajīva (鳩摩羅什 350–409 or 344–413 C.E.)'s translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, namely the *Weimojie suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說經 (T. 14, no. 475)

Krsh 2010 = Seishi Karashima, *A Glossary of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經詞典, Tokyo 2010: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XI).

Krsh 2011 = Seishi Karashima, *A Critical Edition of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經校注, Tokyo 2011: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XII).

Lamotte, Étienne

1994　*The Teaching of Vimalakīrti: (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa)*, from the French translation with introduction and notes (*L'enseignement de Vimalakīrti*) by Étienne Lamotte, rendered into English by Sara Boin, Oxford: The Pali Text Society (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, vol. 32).

Lenz, Timothy

2003　*A New Version of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada and a Collection of Previous-Birth Stories: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 16 + 25*, Seattle: University of Washington Press (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 3).

MC = Middle Chinese reconstruction of the *Qieyun* 切韻 system. In this article, *Qieyun* System forms, reconstructed by Karlgren and revised by F. K. Li, are used. The following further notational changes, made by Coblin (1994), are also adopted here. (1) ·- will be written as ʔ-; (2) ě will be written as *e*.

MI = Middle Indic

Nasim Khan = *Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts from Gandhāra*, published by Muhammad Nasim Khan, Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar 2008.

Nattier, Jan

2006　"The Names of Amitābha/Amitāyus in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations (1)", in: ARIRIAB 9: 183–199.

2007　"The Names of Amitābha/Amitāyus in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations (2)", in: ARIRIAB 10: 359–394.

2008　*A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han* 後漢 *and Three Kingdoms* 三國 *Periods*, Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica X).

2009　"Heaven Names in the Translations of Zhi Qian", in: ARIRIAB, 12: 101–122.

NiDoc = *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions Discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan*, Part I, Text of Inscriptions discovered at the Niya Site, transcribed and edited by A. M. Boyer, E. J. Rapson, and E. Senart, Oxford 1920 (Clarendon Press).

Norman, Kenneth Roy

1991　*Collected Papers*, II, Oxford: The Pali Text Society.

2006　*A Philological Approach to Buddhism*, 1997: London; 2nd ed., Lancaster ²2006: The Pali Text Society.

OIA = Old Indo-Aryan

Pā = Pāli

Salomon, Richard

2000　*A Gāndhārī Version of the Rhinoceros Sūtra: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5B*, Seattle: University of Washington Press (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 1).

2008　*Two Gāndhārī Manuscripts of the Songs of Lake Anavatapta (Anavatapta-gāthā): British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 1 and Senior Scroll 14*, Seattle and London, University of Washington Press (*Gandhāran Buddhist Texts*, vol. 5).

Shyu, Ching-mei (= Chikai)

2008　*A Few Good Women: A study of the Liu du ji jing (A Scripture on the Collection of the Six Perfections) from literary, artistic, and gender perspectives*, Diss. Cornell Univ.

Skt = Sanskrit

SP(KN) = *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, ed. Hendrik Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio, St. Petersbourg 1908–12: Académie Impériale des Sciences (Bibliotheca Buddhica X); repr.: Tokyo 1977: Meicho-Fukyū-Kai.

SP(O) = the so-called Kashgar manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, actually discovered in Khādaliq but purchased in Kashgar. Facsimile edition: *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra. Kashgar Manuscript*, edited by Lokesh Chandra with a foreword by Heinz Bechert, New Delhi 1976 (Śata-Piṭaka Series 229) [repr. Tokyo, Reiyukai, 1977]; *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscripts from the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences (SI P/5, etc.): Facsimile Edition*, published by The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Soka Gakkai, and the Institute of Oriental Philosophy, Tokyo 2013: The Soka Gakkai (Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series 13); transliteration: Hirofumi Toda, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text*, Tokushima ¹1981, ²1983: Kyoiku Shuppan Center, pp. 3–225.

SP(Wi) = Klaus Wille, *Fragments of a Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra from Khādaliq*, Tokyo 2000: Soka Gakkai (Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series 3).

Sukh(SC) = Paul Harrison, Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Kazunobu Matsuda, "Larger Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra," in: *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 2, ed. Jens Braarvig et al., Oslo 2002: Hermes Publishing, pp. 179–214.

T = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, ed. Junjirō Takakusu 高楠順次郎, Kaikyoku Watanabe 渡邊海旭, 100 vols., Tokyo 1924–1934.

Vkn = *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra*, in: *Bonzōkan Taishō Yuimagyō* 梵藏漢対照『維摩經』 *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations*, ed. Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University, Tokyo 2004.

Wan Chin-chuan 萬金川

2008　Zhi Qian yi *Foshuo Weimojie jing*, *Zhufayan pin* diwu Shangbo xiejuan jiaozhu 支謙譯《佛說維摩詰經・諸法言品第五》上博寫卷校注 [Notes on the manuscript of the 5th Chapter, named *Zhufayan*, of Zhi Qian's translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, preserved at Shanghai Museum], in: *Zhengguan Zazhi* 正觀雜誌, vol. 47, Taiwan: Zhengguan Zazhi she 正觀雜誌社, pp. 137–186.

2015　*Weimojie jing* Zhi Qian yiben de dianjiao — Jianlun gaiyijingben de yizheguishu ji qi diben yuyan 《維摩詰經》支謙譯本的點校——兼論該一經本的譯者歸屬及其底本語言 [Textual Criticism of Zhi Qian's Translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*. With discussions on the identity of the translator and the language of the original text], in: *Renjian Fojiao* 人間佛教, new series vol. 1, no. 2, Yilan 宜蘭 (Taiwan), Fo Guang University Center for Buddhist Studies 佛光大學佛教研究中心, pp. 101–232.

Xz = Xuanzang 玄奘 (602[600]–664 C.E.)'s translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* namely the *Shuo Wugoucheng jing* 說無垢稱經 (T. 14, no. 476)

ZQ = Zhi Qian 支謙 (fl. 222–252 C.E.)'s translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, namely the *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經 (T. 14, no. 474)

~ = stem of a word, e.g. *dharma~*

- = absence of word(s); absence of the parallel(s)
° = except for letters, following or preceding the sign, the word is the same as the preceding one,
　　　　e.g. *ratnāmayā* (*v.l.* °*ān*).
* = a hypothetical form which is not attested anywhere, e.g. *snāru
α < β = the form α comes from β, e.g. Pā. *ratana* < OIA *ratna*
← = α ← β: the Chinese character (*or* Sanskrit form) β should be changed to α
/ = indicates interchangeability, e.g. -*y*- / -*ś*-