JIABS

Journal of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 31 Number 1–2 2008 (2010)

The *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* (ISSN 0193-600XX) is the organ of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Inc. As a peer-reviewed journal, it welcomes scholarly contributions pertaining to all facets of Buddhist Studies.
JIABS is published twice yearly.

Manuscripts should preferably be submitted as e-mail attachments to: *editors@iabsinfo.net* as one single file, complete with footnotes and references, in two different formats: in PDF-format, and in Rich-Text-Format (RTF) or Open-Document-Format (created e.g. by Open Office).

Address books for review to:

JIABS Editors, Institut für Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, Prinz-Eugen-Strasse 8–10, A-1040 Wien, AUSTRIA

Address subscription orders and dues, changes of address, and business correspondence (including advertising orders) to:

Dr Jérôme Ducor, IABS Treasurer
Dept of Oriental Languages and Cultures
Anthropole
University of Lausanne
CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
email: *iabs.treasurer@unil.ch*
Web: http://www.iabsinfo.net
Fax: +41 21 692 29 35

Subscriptions to JIABS are USD 55 per year for individuals and USD 90 per year for libraries and other institutions. For informations on membership in IABS, see back cover.

Cover: Cristina Scherrer-Schaub

Font: "Gandhari Unicode" designed by Andrew Glass (http://andrewglass.org/fonts.php)

Print: Ferdinand Berger & Söhne

JIABS

Journal of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 31 Number 1–2 2008 (2010)

Obituaries

Articles

Early Chinese Buddhist translations

Contributions to the International Symposium "Early Chinese Buddhist Translations," Vienna 18–21 April, 2007

Guest editor: Max Deeg

Book review

•

Creating religious terminology

A comparative approach to early Chinese Buddhist translations[1]

Max Deeg

The only translation "project" in the history of religions which can be said to match the transformation of a huge corpus of Buddhist texts into Chinese[2] and later into Tibetan and other Central-Asian languages is the phenomenon of the translation of the Bible into Mediterranean languages as Greek and Latin, into Near Eastern languages as Syriac, Armenian and finally into the evolving national languages of Northern Europe, especially into the different Germanic and Slavonic idioms.[3]

The following paper will concentrate on the comparative aspect of Old-High German translations from Latin, the philological categories which were developed in this context by various scholars and the possible contribution of these for the analysis of early Buddhist Chinese terminology. Even if the linguistic and cultural preconditions are, in both cases, as different as will be sketched below, the structuring of the types of terminological creations in

[1] It is my pleasure to thank my colleague Dr. Dan King, Cardiff University, for his function as *lokapāla* over my hybrid English, and the editors, Dr. Birgit Kellner and Dr. Helmut Krasser, for their valuable suggestions and comments.

[2] See Zürcher 1999: 8: "… the production of the earliest Buddhist texts in Chinese, around the middle of the second century CE, marks a 'linguistic break-through' in the spread of the dharma …"

[3] An overview is found in Stegmüller's article in Hunger, Stegmüller, Erbse, etc. 1988: 149ff.

Germanic languages is, in my eyes, a fundamental and crucial one for any translation process. The advantage of such a comparison is that Germanic philology is clearly ahead in its philological analysis.[4] The paper will concentrate on the earliest stage of the German language preserved, usually classified as Old High German (OHG). This language covers a period – if we start with the earliest literary production of translations in the form of interlinear glosses – of about 600 years between 500 and 1100 and is preserved in a variety of different dialects and mixed forms.

Another historical advantage on the Germanic side is that we have a much better insight into the "workshops" of these early medieval translators – like, e.g., Notker (Labeo) of St. Gallen (ca. 950–1022)[5] or Otfrid of Weißenburg (ca. 800–870) – than in the Sino-Indic case where discussions about translation problems are not completely absent – as can be seen in the letter exchange between Shi Daoan 釋道安 (313–385) and Kumārajīva/Jiumoluoshi 鳩摩羅什 (350–409) – but were held on an abstract level rather than dealing with technical issues of translation.[6]

OHG loan vocabulary was developed over a period of half a millennium and a huge bulk of it became an integral part of the modern German language. Many conceptual terms and words for items of material culture in the language stem from a direct or indirect contact with the Romans or with Late Antique / Early Medieval Latinity. It is certainly true that in China the impact of

---

[4] Another interesting example is the translation process of Greek texts into Syriac, that is from an Indo-European to a Semitic language, for the technical side of which see King 2008.

[5] The medievalist Curtius has called etymology a specific "form of thinking" (Denkform) in the Middle Ages: see Curtius 1967: 486–490, but it seems to be clear that semantic analysis, whatever its character and quality may be in a specific case, is the basis of translation from any language into another.

[6] A list of old versus new translation terms – called Qianhou-chujing-yiji 前後出經異記, "Record of differences in the earlier and later editions of the *sūtra*s" – in Sengyou's 僧祐 *Chu-sanzang-jiji* 出三藏記集 (T.2145.5a.13ff.), however, implies that there was a concrete discourse about technical translation issues.

the Indian languages closely connected with Buddhism did not influence the everyday language to the same degree as Latin did with the Middle- and North-European vernaculars, and the vocabulary (and the material loans)[7] was clearly more restricted to a religious sphere.

It should be emphasized that this paper will not deal with syntactical issues of the translation process, although it seems clear that loan syntagma – the attempt to (re)construct the syntactical form of the original language in the target language – is an important factor of translation processes.[8] The composite verb forms in Germanic languages – the periphrastic perfect, plusquamperfect, future or conditional of the type "I have done" ("Ich habe getan"), etc. – are clearly products of original loan syntagma.[9] Loan syntagmata may provide better terminological criteria for identifying and verifying certain translators or translation "schools" but they are a difficult and complex issue in the Chinese translation texts, a discussion of which would go beyond the scope of this study.[10]

This paper will be mainly concerned with a specific kind of word analysis which must have been underlying the translation processes and is often called etymology but should rather perhaps be called semantic analysis. This analytic process is found in both traditions, the Western-European bible-translation and the Buddhist translations into Chinese and other Central-Asian languages. In the OHG tradition this process of creating terminology in translations is dis-

[7] The impact on material culture is aptly discussed in Kieschnick 2003.

[8] On this issue see Zürcher 1977.

[9] See OHG. *ih habēm gitān*. On theoretical analysis of problems of syntax in translation see Notker's work, discussed in Backes 1982.

[10] It is fair to state that by the digitization of the Chinese Buddhist corpus (especially the CBETA-edition) there has been a development of philological studies of Chinese Buddhist texts which could be called explosive – did the number of scholars involved not interdict this as an exaggeration. A real goldmine for experts' studies in this field is the Annual Report of the Institute for Advanced Buddhist Studies at Sōka University, as can be seen in the bibliographical references in this paper.

cussed by one of the main protagonists involved, Notker, but on the Indo-Chinese side there is little direct evidence of a discussion of the theoretical and practical considerations involved, at least from the side of translators themselves.[11] The Buddhist translators were nevertheless, as can be shown by the analysis of various examples, trained in the tradition of the Indian semantic-etymological *nirvacana* and applied it in their translation work.[12]

By concentrating on the terminological aspect and its categorization I hope to contribute to a systematic framework of analysis for the study of Early Chinese Buddhist terminology which may eventually help to clarify the greater developmental lines in the overall growth of this terminology from the third century until the Tang period and afterwards. While introducing a comparative aspect to the discussion I am, again, fully aware of the linguistic, literary, historical and cultural differences between the two translation processes compared.

First of all, in the case of European tribal cultures like the Germanic, Celtic and Slavonic ones there was no writing system for their languages before the advent of Christianity; the impact of late-Antique Latinity and its scholarship on the translation process applied to the newly arriving scriptures was necessarily an extremely strong one. In contrast to this, Chinese literary culture had already existed for several centuries – from the traditional viewpoint of the Chinese on their own past and antiquity even for millennia – and had a linguistic and expressive cultural apparatus

---

[11] For an example of a theory of translation by the Chinese scholar-monk Yancong 彥琮 (557–610) see Held 1972.

[12] For the development of *nirvacana*, its techniques and the bearing on Indian exegetic tradition see Deeg 1995, Kahrs 1998, and Bronkhorst 2001. Funayama's article in the present volume impressively presents one of these *nirvacana*-users, Paramārtha/Zhendi 真諦 (500–569), at work. Similar to the European case where semantic analysis was standing in the Latin tradition of such authors as Marcus Terentius Varro (116–27 B.C.) and the later antique author Isidorus of Seville (ca. 560–636), the Asian translators, even if they do not refer to it verbally, built on the principles developed in the framework of autochthonous Sanskrit philology.

which in quantity at least was a match for the Indian imports arriving with Buddhism.

There is the typological difference between the two languages, the original language and the target language, in both translation processes: in the case of Germanic languages two inflective Indo-European languages with a certain flexibility of word formation through prefixes, suffixes and compounding-elements are involved, while in the Buddhist case the translation went from a similarly structured Indo-European language – Prākṛt or, later on, Sanskrit – to an isolating language, Chinese, which did not have a clear prefixal and suffixal word-formative and morphological system. This difference certainly had an impact on the way in which translators mastered their task of creating new terminology in the target language. The awareness of the difference is, though very much "romanticized," visible in Chinese sources, as for instance in Sengyou's 僧祐 (445–518) catalogue-descriptor Chu-sanzang-jiji 出三藏記集:

> The plainness and elegance of expressions are [also] tied to the management of the brush. Some excelled in the Hu meanings, but they did not comprehend the Chinese purports; others understood Chinese but they did not know the Hu sense. Even though they may have had a partial understanding, in the end, they were cut off from a complete comprehension. … How could there be obstacles in the *sūtra*? There were merely failures [caused by] the translators![13]

Another difference between the two translation processes is that in the medieval period Christian monks translated from one classical language, Latin, the structure of which had already been analyzed by the classical, mainly Stoic grammarians. Problems were rather caused in the target languages, as there were different Germanic dialects involved:[14] an originally Old-Saxon scribe and translator,

---

[13] T.2145.4c.20ff. 辭之質文繫於執筆。或善胡義，而不了漢旨，或明漢文，而不曉胡意。雖有偏解，終隔圓通。 … 豈經礙哉？譯之失耳！ Translation by Link 1961: 289.

[14] This raises the question of Chinese dialects' impact on the early translations, although this is, of course, an almost impenetrable aspect of the translation process, due to the historical sources and the character of

for example, in Fulda could well have been responsible for the writing-down of a translated text and could have infiltrated the OHG with his native dialect's forms.[15]

Although the Indian grammatical tradition in the *paraṃparā* of Pāṇini was not less sophisticated than the Stoic one, the translators of Buddhist texts into Chinese could not completely rely on such a systematic penetration of the language which they translated nor did they have an elaborated linguistic analysis of their own language at hand. They had to deal with the ambiguities and problems of mostly North-Western Middle-Indic Prākṛts[16] from which they probably mostly translated during the first two or three centuries. Chinese, with her long tradition of written language and literary forms and genres, did not have the same flexibility as the Germanic languages and their oral literature, or, to come up with an example from the Buddhist side, as the Tibetan language which could be remodeled according to the underlying Sanskrit and its grammatical (*vyākaraṇa*) and semantic (*nirvacana*) hermeneutic tradition. Thus

---

the largely a-phonetic Chinese writing system.

[15] A concrete similar case is the OHG heroic poem "Hildebrandslied" (Song of Hildebrand) where OHG and Anglo-Saxon create a mixed translation idiom.

[16] Hypothetically the underlying language of some of these translations has been identified as Gāndhārī. Brough 1975 and von Hinüber have worked out some examples of "misrenderings" from this language, as did, although being rather careful in his identifications, Karashima 1993, 1994, etc. This hypothesis has gained and is still gaining a steady flow of new textual and linguistic material from the British Library documents worked on by Richard Salomon and his research group at the University of Washington (see Andrew Glass' article in the present volume) and from a group of manuscripts in Pakistan worked on by Harry Falk and his team at the Freie Universität Berlin (for a first preliminary overview of the new collection see Strauch [2007]). The reservations which Boucher brings forth against this "Gāndhārī-hypothesis" start to become relative if the normal span of dialectic variants and the possibility of blending with a "Hochsprache" – the famous problem of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit – is kept in mind which, by the way, is found in a very similar fashion in OHG translations.

the place name Śrāvasti, so frequently found in Buddhist *sūtra*s, could be rendered as Tib. *mñan yod*, lit.: "hearing-is," because according to the *nirvacana* tradition of analyzing a word by different lexemes or roots, √*śru* (*śrav-*; "to hear") and √*as* (*-asti*; "is").

Despite these differences in terms of cultural development, however, the tasks for the translators in both areas were not so different after all. The outcome was in both cases what Erich Zürcher has called a "scriptural language"[17] in the sense that it at the same time contained elements of the elite vernacular of the respective period, and foreign elements, mainly in terms of translation terminology.

In the following discussion, I will structure my examples on a categorization which was elaborated by the German philologist Werner Betz in the context of Old-High German (OHG) translations of Latin texts.[18] I think that this delivers an appropriate heuristic[19] tool for structuring early Chinese Buddhist terminology and thus may help to avoid the confusion which can be caused by the use of autochthonous categories such as *geyi* 格義, "matching of concepts," which, after all, is rather a theoretical concept used and discussed by scholar-monks who were not necessarily involved in the translation process itself.[20]

I have tried to translate Betz's terminology – which partly corresponds to the systematic English terminology used by the American-Norwegian linguist Einar Haugen[21] – into English, although I myself have to raise some doubts as to wether I have been able to do this correctly and intelligibly in all cases. For each category I will present one or a few example from the OHG corpus and will then give examples from the Chinese corpus. These examples

---

[17] Zürcher 1991: 279ff.

[18] Betz 1965; Betz 1974.

[19] This term is meant to point out that there are, of course, no strict boundaries and that there is overlap between the categories.

[20] On *geyi* see: T'ang 1951, Itō 1990, Lai 1978.

[21] Haugen 1953. Haugen's and other linguists' systematization were already taken into account in a study by Chen 2004 of translations of Kumārajīva and Xuanzang.

are mainly drawn from Seishi Karashima's extensive philological and analytical work on the Chinese *Lotus sūtra*[22] in general and on Dharmarakṣa's/Zhu Fahu's 竺法護 (active 265–313) early translation of the *sūtra*, the *Zhengfahua-jing* 正法華經 translated in 286, a text which belongs to the older stratum of translations.[23] Although having used Karashima's (and others') work heavily I have tried, nevertheless, to use material which has been left open to further analysis.[24]

While Kumārajīva's later translation of the *Lotus* has traditionally been considered to be better in stylistic terms and in terms of translation technique, Dharmarakṣa's version definitely has the advantage at giving some insight into the "workshop" of an early translator. In some cases he translates more correctly; for instance, when Kumārajīva just uses *fo* 佛 or *rulai* 如來 for the different epithets of the Buddha, Dharmarakṣa usually tries to render them semantically correct – at least from his own analytical point of view – as, for instance, in the case of *renzhongshang* 人中上 for *puruṣottama*[25] where Kumārajīva has only a simple *fo* 佛.[26]

After these preliminary remarks I will present Betz's classification system and give examples from his corpus and from the

---

[22] Boucher 1998; Karashima 2001. On examples from another text attributed to Dharmarakṣa, the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchāsūtra*, see Boucher 2001, and, expectably in more detail, Boucher 2008. On an introductory discussion of some examples from Zhi Qian's 支謙 (active 220–252) corpus, some of which may have been taken over by Dharmarakṣa and others, see Nattier 2003.

[23] On Dharmarakṣa as a translator there are two American PhD thesis by Man 2002, and Boucher 1996. On a detailed discussion of the oldest Chinese translations see now Nattier 2008.

[24] As the data and their concrete location and bibliographical references are easily accessible through Karashima's three main publications (1993), (1998) and (2001) on the *Lotus* I have abstained from giving them here and refer the reader interested in these details to these publications.

[25] Similarly *wushangshi* 無上士 for *anuttarapuruṣa* in Zhi Qian's translations: Nattier 2003: 227.

[26] See Nattier 2003: 234.

translation corpus of the *Lotus sūtra*. Betz discerns the following categories and subcategories:

1. Lehnwort / Loanword
   1.1. Fremdword / Foreign word
   1.2. Assimiliertes Fremdwort / Assimilated foreign word
2. Lehnprägung / Loan moulding
   2.1. Lehnbildung / Loan formation
      2.1.1. Lehnformung / Loan shaping
         2.1.1.1. Lehnübersetzung / Loan translation
         2.1.1.2. Lehnübertragung / Loan rendering
   2.2. Lehnbedeutung / Loan meaning

1. Loanword (Lehnwort)

A loanword is a word which keeps its phonetic form completely or partly; this is what is normally called transliteration and would be called *yinyi*/*onyaku* 音譯 ("translation by sound") in traditional Chinese or Japanese terminology.[27] For Betz there is a difference between 1.1. foreign word[28] ("Fremdwort") as such and 1.2. assimilated loanword ("assimiliertes Lehnwort").

In Germanic translation languages we also find loanword (transliteration) and loan shaping (see below) side by side: This was, for instance, definitely the case with the word for cross (*crucifix*), *krūzi*, as an assimilated loanword, also *wīziboum*, "tree of condemnation" (attested once) and *galgo*, "gallow" (attested 20 times). Thus the sometimes irritating concurrence of a loanword (transliteration) and a semantic rendering of the same word in early Chinese trans-

[27] Beside the general discussion of early stages of transliterations in Chinese in Pulleyblank 1983 there have been studies of transliterations found in texts or collections of texts: see Karashima 1994 on the *Dīrghāgama*, South Coblin 1983 on the early translators in the context of Late Han glosses, and Harrison, South Coblin 1999 on early *mantra* transliterations from the *Drumakimnararājaparipṛcchāsūtra*.

[28] This should be differentiated from the term "borrowed word," as it is not only borrowed but marked by the fact that it is (still) recognizable as a foreign word.

lation texts may be regarded as a normal rather than an exceptional case.

Otfrid of Weißenburg shows a clear awareness for such a concurrent situation when he discusses the word "angel" which may be rendered in OHG as *engil* or as *boto*:

> What we call 'engil' (angel), is called 'boton' (messenger) in the Franconian vernacular for (those) people, (because they) always want to report … what they have been told (by God).[29]

There is one clear difference between the OHG and the Chinese translations in this category: while names (personal, geographical) were always transliterated in OHG, from a very early stage onwards the Chinese translations used both transliteration (category 1) and semantic renderings (category 2). Strictly speaking all OHG names would belong to category 1 (although scholars like Betz only discuss appellativa under this heading), and I therefore feel entitled to include Sino-Buddhist transliterations of names under this category.

1.1. Foreign word (Fremdwort)

A foreign word is closely preserved in its original phonetic form in the borrowing language. In OHG these words are rather rare, and this is certainly due to the simultaneous and predominant use of Latin and the quick adaptation of loanwords to the phonetic and morphological system of the target language.

The main difference in this category is that in OHG foreign words are mainly found in the area of material culture. Examples are *wīn*, "wine," from Lat. *vinum*, or OHG *munih*, "monk," from Lat. *monachus*.[30] In the case of real cultural items or institutions being taken over with foreign words, they lost their foreign taint relatively quickly. If there was no material equivalence the words

---

[29] Betz 1965: 71: "thaz wir engil nennen, thaz heizent boton in githiuti frenkisge liuti, thie io thaz irwellent, thaz sie thaz gizellent … so was so in gibotan."

[30] There is, however, also one example of loan translation, *einago*: cf. Köbler 2006: 138.

tended to be considered as foreign elements for quite some time, as e.g. OHG *palma*, *palmboum*, "palm," for Lat. *palma*.

In Chinese at least the same rate or percentage of foreign words is found in basic religious or doctrinal terminology. In the Chinese case the oldest words for Buddha, Bodhisattva and *saṅgha*, *fo* 佛, *pusa* 菩薩 and *seng* 僧 – in their Early Middle Chinese pronunciation reconstructable as **but*, **səŋ*, and **bɔ-sat*[31] –, were definitely considered to be foreign words when they were first conceived and used. But during the historical development of the language – phonetic change and semantic integration – these words certainly shifted more and more to the second subgroup and became assimilated loanwords, provided that they were kept in use at all. This is the case with the early transliteration *Mile* 彌勒/**mjiɛ-lɛk* for *Maitreya*, which phonetically makes sense in the light of a form *Metrega*.[32] This shows that, despite problems concerning the correct reconstruction of the historical phonology of Chinese in the first centuries CE, the aspect of reconstruction is an important tool

[31] I here use the reconstructions (indicated by the asterisk * throughout the text) of Pulleyblank for practical rather than "ideological" reasons. (Owing to font limitations I have not been able to represent all IPA characters correctly.) Without being able to go into detail it should be pointed out that there are problems involved in the reconstruction of Early Middle Chinese, that is the linguistic standard of an assumed vernacular of the elite from the end of the Latter Han period (late second century) to the Tang (seventh century and later). Reconstruction of various periods of pronunciation of Chinese in the West started with Karlgren's work and has been carried on by scholars such as Pulleyblank and South Coblin, and on the Chinese side by Li Fanggui and others. The hermeneutical circle with the Buddhist transcriptional corpus evidently lies in the fact that forms reconstructed from purely Chinese material such as rhyme-tables and onomastic glosses which are mainly based on a phonological system have to be applied to a corpus of words/forms the correct linguistic judgement of which would require more sophisticated phonetic reconstruction. Taking into account all these points it seems to be fair, however, to use the mentioned reconstructional corpora to think about phonetic implications arising from the underlying Indic terminology of the transcriptions.

[32] Another example for *le* representing r-V-g-V (V = vowel) from Dharmarakṣa's corpus is *mohoule* 摩睺勒/**ma-ɣəw-lɛk* for *mahoraga*.

at least for the understanding of loanwords and has to be taken into account, be it with appropriate caution.

1.2. Assimilated loanword (assimiliertes Lehnwort)

An assimilated loanword is phonetically and morphologically – as the name implies – assimilated to the target language. An example from OHG would be *trahton* : Lat. *tractare*, in the sense of "to strive for." Here in OHG the Latin *a*-stem verb had to be transferred into a Germanic verb-category, into an *-ōn*-stem verb. The verb also shows assimilation in terms of phonetic change: it had become integrated in the OHG vocabulary at a relatively early period and already undergone the second – or High-German – sound shift in which the Latin guttural *c* : /*k*/ became a fricative *h* : /*χ*/.

Due to the general characteristics of the language it is not possible – and also not necessary – to adopt the word category and the endings of Indic languages in Chinese. Thus the feature which is important in inflective languages in order to identify such an assimilated loanword – morphemes – is of no help in the case of Chinese. One could argue that the way of rendering a word into Chinese characters and the acceptance of such a transliteration may be considered as a marker of assimilation. The assumed early creation of graphs for the loanwords **but* 佛 : Buddha,[33] and **səŋ* 僧 : *saṅgha*,[34] and the continuity of their use seem to be such indicators for assimilated loanwords.

One could argue that hybrid renderings, in which one part of a name/term is given phonetically while another part is translated semantically, belong to the category of assimilated loanwords from the moment of their creation. In Dharmarakṣa's corpus we find examples like *Binnouwentuoni*(*-zi*) 邠耨文陀尼(子)[35]/**pin-nəwh-*

[33] Semantic (*ren*) 人, "man" + phonetic *fu*/**put* 弗 as a negative particle ("non-," "un-").

[34] Semantic (*ren*) 人, "man" + phonetic *ceng* (*zeng*)/**dzəŋ*(**tsəŋ*) 曾, in the sense of "assembly of people."

[35] Or: *Fennouwentuoni-zi* 分耨文陀尼子.

mun-da-nri-(*tsɨ'*) for *Pūrṇa Maitrāyaṇīputra*[36] with a semantic *-zi* 子 for *-putra*.

It is clear that a loanword is only considered as a foreign element inside the target language for a certain time. After cultural and linguistic integration – not least caused through sound changes – the respective term on a common level will not be felt as a foreign element anymore, although a reflective discourse well may uphold the notion of exoticism or strangeness. Thus the above mentioned examples for Buddha, Bodhisattva and *saṅgha* would be considered to be part of the normal vocabulary of the Chinese language, although their foreign origin may cause some dispute. These adopted terms may then be "challenged" or eventually be replaced by new foreign words like *fuotuo*/**but-da* 佛陀 or *sengjia*/**səŋ-kɨa* 僧迦. I would even argue that the word *futu*/**buw-dɔ* 浮圖 (and the synonym 浮屠), attested very early for Buddha and considered to be of Central-Asian origin by Prof. Ji Xianlin 季羡林,[37] is just a concurrent term for the older *fo*, which was introduced into the language when the Early Middle Chinese pronunciation no longer corresponded exactly to the original Indian pronunciation.[38]

---

[36] There are also complete transliterations such as *Binnouwentuofu* 邠耨文陀弗/**pin-nəwh-mun-da-put*, *Bintiwentuofu* 邠提文陀弗/**pin-dɛj-mun-da-put*; there is also an attempt to render the name semantically *Manyuan-zi* 滿願子 *Pūrṇamaitrāyaṇīputra*, Pa. *Puṇṇa-mantāniputta* (see Karashima 1992: 26), cp. *Manzhu-zi* 滿祝子 in Zhi Qian's 支謙 Da-mingdu-jing 大明度經 (483a.11) (see Karashima 1992: 277), clearly showing that the name element corresponding to Skt. *Maitrāyaṇi-* was considered to be *mantra-*, "word, wish, vow."

[37] Ji 1992.

[38] For phonetic reasons on the Indian side I would rather propose that Chinese had a weak vowel after plosive endings – **butə*, **səŋə*, **bɔ-satə* – in the earliest period of Buddhist transcriptions (first/second cent.) which would well correspond to the proposed weak final vowel < Skt. *–a*(*ḥ*), etc. by Fussmann 1989 for spoken Gāndhārī. In the case of the obviously very early standardized transliteration for *bodhisattva* it seems strange that the creator(s) did not choose a character with a dental final for *bodhi-* instead of *pu-*/**bɔ-*. In the light of the Gāndhārī forms of the word, however, as for instance *boṣisatvo* (see e.g. Lenz 2003: 264a.), one could well argue

Between both groups have to be counted what I would call redundant hybrid loanwords; these are loanwords, transliterations, which are either explained by a semantic synonym or by a generic term. An example would be *chatu* 剎土 for *lokadhātu* in which *cha* 剎/**thaɨt* is a transliteration for a Prākṛt correspondent of a synonymous Skt. *kṣetra* to *dhātu*. Another example is *Qishejue*(*-shan*)/**gji-dzia-gut-*° 耆闍崛山 for *Gṛdhrakūṭa*. From Dharmarakṣa's corpus one could refer to *chan-ding* 禪定 and *chan-si* 禪思 for *dhyāna* where the simplex *chan*/**dzian* 禪has certainly already become an assimilated loanword in connection with the semantic explanatory elements *ding* 定, "concentration," or *si* 思, "concentrated mind." A similar example is *sanmei*(*zhi*)*-ding*/**samh-məjh* 三昧(之)定 for a simple *samādhi*.

2. Loan moulding (Lehnprägung)

Loan mouldings[39] – what Haugen calls a "loanshift" – with its various subcategories are semantic renderings which in the traditional Chinese/Japanese terminology are called *yiyi*/*giyaku* 義譯 ("translations by meaning"). In the Buddhist context the standardized term for *dharma* – to complete the *triratna* – was from a very early period the Chinese semantic correspondent *fa* 法, and transcription was restricted to personal names (*tan* or *tanmo*).[40] For this group Dharmarakṣa's translations are a goldmine because he usually avoids transliterations/loanwords in favor of semantic renderings.

---

that the Chinese transliteration is based on a sloppy oral (haplologically abridged) form of the Gāndhārī.

[39] Or: "loan coinage"?

[40] This standardization did not occur in other cases, as Vetter and Zacchetti 2004 have shown for the Dharmarakṣa-corpus (example *jingfa* 經法 for *dharma*).

This group is divided by Betz into a number of subcategories:

2.1. Loan formation (Lehnbildung)

In this category – called "creation" by Haugen – the translator tries to copy the structure of the original word by means of semantic elements in the target language. This requires a formal and semantic analysis of the original term and an application of this analytic knowledge to the target language as well.

In Latin such analytical know-how was procured, as already mentioned, through the work of the grammarians. In the Indian context two "schools" of interpretation were at hand when it came to analyzing a word: the Pāṇini-school of grammar, *vyākaraṇa*, and the *nirvacana* school of Indian semantic analysis.[41] Now unfortunately no direct discursive reference is preserved, as far as I know, to the use of the *nirvacana* tradition as a means of semantic analysis for early Chinese translators. I would argue, however, that many examples from the early translation corpus clearly show that this *nirvacana* was indeed a preferred method of analyzing Indic terms and names and translating them into Chinese – and Tibetan as well – instead of using the analysis of the grammarians into prefixes, roots and derivational elements. A typical *nirvacana*-analysis breaks a word down into two (or more) verbal elements (roots), as in the example of the Tibetan translation of Śrāvasti. The explanations found in the Tibetan bilingual dictionary *sGra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa/Mahāvyutpatti* (beginning of the 9th cent.) very often indicate a deliberate decision for a *nirvacana*-analysis although they reflect the "correct" *vyākaraṇa*-analysis of the same word. I only want to give as one example the discussion of the term *arhat*:

> The word *arhat* is on the one hand (explained) as '*pūj*[*ā*]*m ar*[*a*]*hatīti arhan*,' being called 'worth of veneration' because he is worthy of being venerated by gods, men and all the others; on the other hand it is said: '*kleśārihatavān arh*[*ā*]*n*,' meaning 'having defeated the enemy

[41] See note 12.

of suffering.' From these (two ways of explanation) the (one based) on meaning is taken and (the translation) is fixed as '*dgra-bcom-pa*'."[42]

Having presented the "traditional" explanation for *arhat* I cannot resist to think of the Chinese *wu*(*suo*)*zhuo* 無(所)著[43] which, in my view, reflects another analysis of the word: it is possible that it was parsed as being derived from √*labh-* – with the interchangeability of *r* and *l* – for which Prākṛt forms *lahēi* and *lahaï* and even Niya-Prākṛt (Southern Silkroad) *lahaṃti* are documented.[44] That such a derivation is possible is shown by Dharmarakṣa's translation *wuzhuo-guang-sanmei* 無著光三昧, "unattached-light-*samādhi*"– obviously taken as *a-nilambh* + √*bhā-* – for a Skt. *anilambha-samādhi* (Kumārajīva: *wuyuan-sanmei* 無緣三昧).

2.1.1. Loan shaping (Lehnformung)

Loan shapings clearly use semantic equivalents in rendering the original word in the target language. Depending on the level of formal equivalence two subgroups are discernable:

2.1.1.1. Loan translation (Lehnübersetzung)

In loan translations (Haugen: "literal creation") the semantic context and form of the translated word are as close to the original term as possible. OHG *gawizzani* – prefix *gi-* and a nominal derivation from *wizzan* – for Lat. *conscientia* is a good example of the large number of words belonging to this group.

---

[42] *arhan śes bya ba gcig tu na / pū ja ma ra ha tī ti a rhan śes bya ste / lha daṅ mi la sogs pa kun gyis mchod par 'os pas na mchod 'os śes kyaṅ bya / yaṅ gcig tu na / kle śa a ri ha da bān arhan śes bya ste / ñon moṅs pa'i dgra bcom pa śes kyaṅ bya ste / rnam pa 'di las 'dir ni don bcan par bya ste dgra bcom pa śes btags*. Text quoted after Simonsson 1957: 269.

[43] See also the discussion in Nattier 2003: 215ff., who thinks that the term was analysed as **a-rāga*, "devoid of passionate attachments" (translation Nattier).

[44] See Turner 1966: 635, s.v. *lábhatē*.

Most of the Indic compounds translated into Chinese belong to this category and did not cause too many problems. Some examples from Dharmarakṣa's *Lotus*, chosen randomly, are: the *dvandva chengying* 城營 for *nagaranigama*, "city and market place;" *edao* 惡道 (lit.: "evil path") for *durgati*; *liangzu* 兩足 – as a real *bahuvrīhi* in Chinese – *dvipada*, "biped." Dharmarakṣa's *daci-dabei* 大慈大悲 *mahāmaitrī-mahākaruṇā* is giving a word-by-word rendering where Kumārajīva has a simple *cibei* 慈悲. In contrast, in some cases Dharmarakṣa, by using this category of rendering, produces a simpler rendering than Kumārajīva: *lokahita* is translated by *shimin'ai* 世愍哀 "one who is sympathetic with the world,"[45] where Kumārajīva has a complex *zhu-fo zhi jiushi-zhe* 諸佛之救世者, "the Buddhas, savers of the world."

Dharmarakṣa consequently uses semantic renderings even in cases of generic names (e.g. of plants) where one could argue that a transliteration would have been more appropriate and was actually used by later translators: *shengxiang* 生香 (lit.: "born-fragrance") for *jāti*(*ka*)*gandha* where Kumārajīva uses a hybrid *sheti-hua-xiang* 闍提華香/**dʑia-dɛj-*˚; or *jietuo-hua* 解脫華 ("liberation-flower") for *mukta-kusuma* versus Kumārajīva's *zhong-minghua* 眾名華, standing for *nānāratnakusuma*.

There are other examples where it is not obvious in the first place why the translator formed his terms: *fangdeng* 方等 certainly stands for *vaitulya* rather than for (*mahā*)*vaipulya*, in which *fang* 方 represents the prefix *vi-* (in the sense of "apart, spread") and *deng* 等 renders *tulya*, "equal, similar;" Kumārajīva instead uses the more generalized expression *dasheng-jing* 大乘經, *mahāyānasūtra*.

But also translations which seem a little bit far-fetched match this category, as e.g. Dharmarakṣa's translation *ren* 忍, "to bear, to endure," for *Sahā* which takes the Indic word to be derived from √*sah-*, "to suffer, to endure, to tolerate." *Xiangyin*(*-shen*) 香音神 for *gandharva* presupposes an analysis into *gandha-*, "perfume" + *rava* (√*ru-*, "to give a sound"); similar is *da-yiyin-hua* 大意音華 for

[45] *-hita* here obviously taken in the sense of "sympathetic, friendly"; see also the variant reading *hitānukaṃpā*, "friendly and compassionate" given in Kern, Nanjio (392, note 1).

mahāmandārava where, beside *-mandā-* being taken to belong to √*man*, *-rava* is taken again to be a derivation from √*ru-*.

In the Chinese context this and the next group are probably the largest categories due to the typological and linguistic differences with the Indic languages. This is also the group in which a lot of so-called mistranslations[46] are found, which, however, very often – as the work of Seishi Karashima and others shows – reveal a clear semantic analysis on the basis of the underlying Prākṛt.[47] Due to the ambiguity of the language this even multiplies the possibilities for *nirvacana*-analysis compared to Sanskrit. One of the well-established terms is one of the epithets of the Buddha, *shizun* 世尊, the "world-honored one," for Skt. *bhagavat*, which obviously had been broken into the elements *bhaga* + √*vand-*, "to honor, to venerate," and was, at least in the early period of translations, in "competition" with another, structurally similar term, *tianzun* 天尊, the "one honored by the gods."[48]

There are some cases where we may be able to find an explanation for certain renderings as products of a loan translational process. For instance, in Dharmarakṣa's *Lotus* translation we find the strange expression *dumen* 度門, lit.: "gate of salvation," for *paramasukha*, "highest bliss," where Kumārajīva has the slightly overstretched *jingmiao-diyi zhi le* 淨妙第一之樂, "pure, delicate and highest bliss." Keeping in mind now that Dharmarakṣa renders *dharmamukha* by *famen* 法門, which establishes, *inter aliud*, *men* 門, lit.: "gate, door," as a translation for *mukha*, I feel tempted to think that the translator had an original **pāra*(*ṃ*)*mukha* which he had no other choice than to translate by *dumen* 度門.

---

[46] On a discussion of the applicability of the term mistranslation in this context see Deeg 1995b.

[47] What level such forms based on a kind of Prākṛtic "proto-philology" can attain can be seen in Karashima's 1999 discussion of the relevant early translations of the name of Avalokiteśvara, finally standardized as Chin. Guan(shi)yin 觀(世)音, or Karashima's and Nattier's 2005 observations on the name Śāriputra, Chin. Qiuluzi 秋露子.

[48] For a full discussion of these terms see Deeg 2004, and Nattier 2003: 232ff., the latter also discusses other translations for *bhagavat*.

If we accept the Prākṛtic hypothesis for early Buddhist translations we may add a lot of examples to the category under discussion. For this I would like to bring forth some examples from the *Lotus sūtra* translation of Dharmarakṣa:

Baoyin 寶音 for (the *kalpa*) *Ratnāvabhāsa* where *yin* 音 is obviously taken for a derivation from the root √*bhāṣ-* (Skt. *avabhāṣa*?) instead of from √*bhās-*. *Sanda* 三達, lit.: "three achievements" – contrasted with Kumārajīva's *sanming* 三明 – for *traividya*, "threefold knowledge," makes sense if we assume a derivation from √*vid-*/*vindati*, "to acquire, to get, to possess." Translations like *ruyi-bao*(*zhu*) 如意寶珠, *ruyi-zhu* 如意珠, *ruyi-zhi-zhu* 如意之珠 for *maṇiratna* may have been caused by an analysis of the first element *maṇi* as belonging to *mānin* (√*man-*), "thinking to be …, thinking to have."[49] The rendering *fan-renji-*(*tianzi*) 梵忍跡(天子) for *brahmā sahāṃpati* seems to have an underlying analysis into √*sah-* + *padi*(*n*) (or: *pathi*, see above the example of Mahāprajāpati), while *haozun* 豪尊 for *kṣitipati*/*mahipati* takes the same, second membrum *-pati*, Pkt. *-*vaṃdi* as belonging to √*vand-*.[50]

Even examples, which, at first view, look very odd such as Dharmarakṣa's *muren* 母人, "mother," as a translation for *vadhukā*, "widow" – which Kumārajīva "correctly" renders as *guanü* 寡女 – start to make sense if we allow a Prākṛtic interpretation **vatukā* (interpreted as Skt. *mātṛkā*).[51] In the same way *aihu* 哀護, "compassion and protection," for *karuṇāyamāna* – Kumārajīva has *dacibei* 大慈悲 – may be taken as derived from *karuṇā* + √*yam-* in the sense of "to restrict, to protect," or *Anyang*(*-guo*) 安養(國), lit.: "peace-fostering," for *Sukhāvatī-lokadhātu* (Kumārajīva: *Anleshijie* 安樂世界), as derived from a **Sukhāvad*(*h*)*ī*, taking *-vadhī* as a Prākṛt-form belonging to √*vṛdh-*, "to increase, to (let) grow" and rendering it as *yang* 養, "to bring up, to foster, to nourish." Bold as

[49] See Gāndhārī *maṇa* for Skt. *manas*, e.g. Salomon 2000: 232a.

[50] For the interchange of *p* and *v* in North-Western Prākṛt see e.g. Salomon 2001: 85. I suspect that *hao* 豪 here stands for *mahi-* rather than for *kṣiti-*, in a slightly redundant meaning of "strong, powerful, leader."

[51] For the interchange of *v* and *m* in North-Western Prākṛt see Allon 2001: 86.

it may appear, I am willing to admit a sound semantic analysis for *Shangshi-jiaye* 上時迦葉 as a translation for *Uruvilva-kāśyapa*, in which a Prākṛtic **uvvelā* could be interpreted and be translated as **ud-velā*, "upper time."

I would thus argue in general that some cases in which we tend to judge the translations as wrong, are, seen from the standpoint of the translator, products of a clear analytic process: Dharmarakṣa's *monengsheng* 莫能勝, "who cannot be defeated by anybody" for the epithet of Maitreya, *ajita*, "invincible," is obviously the attempt to render the past participle passive (PPP) of the Indic name in Chinese – a problem which Kumārajīva avoids by using a transliteration. A similar case, where a past participle passive is correctly given by Dharmarakṣa, is the translation of the name of the bodhisattva *Sadāparibhūta* as *Changbeiqingman* 常被輕慢, the "one who is constantly disregarded," where Kumārajīva has the opposite and rather nonsensical *Changbuqing* 常不輕, the "often not-despised," which only makes sense in the chapter to which it gives its title if it is taken in an active sense "always not-despising."

Single expressions, due to the tendency of Chinese for two-character-words (binoms), often were translated as synonymous *dvandva*-like binoms: *daoxing* 道行 for *caryā*. Another example is *zongchi* 總持 for *dhāraṇī*, in which *zong* obviously is used – like in another of Dharmarakṣa's renderings, *zongshui* 總水, literally "carrying water," for *jaladhara* – to semantically reflect *chi* 持, "to hold," √*dhṛ*-. To this "redundant" category one may also count examples such as *lüluo* 驢騾 for *gardabha*, "ass, donkey," despite the semantically slightly deviating *luo* 騾, "mule;" or *guanzhou* 關軸 (lit.: "connection-shaft") for *argala*, "bolt."

There are also some adverbial-syntactical renderings trying to cope with the Indic word-structure like *bubu* 步步 – against Kumārajīva's simple *jian* 漸 – for *karma-krameṇa*. Again, here and elsewhere one can clearly recognize Dharmarakṣa's tendency for a word-by-word rendering. See also, as a similar example, *changye* 長夜 for *dīrgharātram*.

As has already been indicated, there is a tendency in Dharmarakṣa's translation to give semantic renderings instead of transliterations. He uses *buhuan* 不還, "non-returner," for *anāgāmin*,

and *butuizhuan* 不退轉, "not retrogressing," for *avaivartika*; Kumārajīva uses the loanword *a'nahan* 阿那含 for the first but in most cases keeps the (semantic) translation for the latter expression.

The same stands true for renderings of personal names: Dharmarakṣa translates *Chimingwen* 持名聞, "bearer of fame," for *Yaśodharā*, where Kumārajīva uses the loanword/transliteration *Yeshutuoluo* 耶輸陀羅/**jia-ɕuə-da-ra*. The same is seen by Dharmarakṣa's Prākṛtic *nirvacana*-rendering of *Mahāprajāpati* as *Da-jingkui* 大敬逵, "great respected thoroughfare," which – like the alternative translation *Da-aidao* 大愛道 – supports Brough's interpretation[52] as going back to an underlying **Mahāpiyapadi* (Skt. **Mahāpriyapathī*). Dharmarakṣa renders *Mañjughoṣa* as *Purouruan-yin* 溥柔軟音, "broad (and) soft sound,"[53] while Kumārajīva, once more, has the transliteration *Wenshushili* 文殊師利/**mun-dzuə́-şi-lih*.[54] Dharmarakṣa renders *Śākyamuni* as *Nengren* 能仁 in which *neng* 能 for *Śākya* is derived from √*śak-* ("to be able to"), and *ren* stands for *muni*.[55] The *arhat Gavāṃpati* is translated by Dharmarakṣa as *niushi* 牛呞, "cow-ruminating," which may reflect a North-Western Prākṛt **Gavāṃvadi*, "speaker of cows."[56]

Even the word order of the original is sometimes kept by Dharmarakṣa where Kumārajīva syntagmatises his rendering and thus changes the order of the single words:[57] e.g. for *Mahāsthāmaprāpta*

---

[52] Brough 1975.

[53] I suspect that Dharmarakṣa's *rouruan-yin-hua* 柔軟音華 for *mañjūṣaka* was influenced by his rendering of Mañjughoṣa; Kumārajīva has *manshusha-hua* 曼殊沙華/**muanh-dzuə-ʂa*ɨ.

[54] For Mañjuśrī Dharmarakṣa has Pushou 溥首, "broad head," in which *śrī* is taken as belonging to *śir*(*as*), "head": Karashima 1992: 27.

[55] The Tang-period *Yiqiejing-yinyi* 一切經音義 takes *nengren* for *Śākya* only (T.2128.465b.5), while the Song-period *Fanyi-mingyi-ji* 翻譯名義集 correctly recognizes it to be a rendering for *Śākyamuni* (T.2131.1055a.18f.).

[56] For the interchange of *p* and *v* see note 50.

[57] From Dharmarakṣa's corpus the example of *huadu*(-*shu*) 畫度(樹) for *pāracitraka* seems to be an example of such an inverted compound,

Dharmarakṣa's *Dashi-zhi* 大勢至 (lit.: "Great-power-attained") versus Kumārajīva's *De-dashi* 得大勢 (lit.: "Achieved-great-power"). The same analytic pattern can be seen at work in *jieluan* 劫亂 (lit.: "*kalpa*-confusion") for *kalpasaṃkṣobha*, where Kumārajīva uses the inverted *zhuojie* 濁劫 (lit.: "chaotic-*kalpa*").

Dharmarakṣa's monosyllabic *bie* 別 – where Kumārajīva has the "regular" *shouji* 授記 – is certainly based on a grammatical analysis of *vyākaraṇa* as derived from *vi-ā-√kṛ-* "to take apart, to separate, to analyse."[58] In contrast in the case of *dingyi* 定意 for *samādhi* he seems to have added a redundant *yi* 意 which may be an attempt to render the root *√dhyā-*.[59]

Even in cases in which the analysis of a certain word by the translator is not completely clear we might suppose an underlying analysis, as for instance in the hapax legomenon *wuke*(*-yu*) 無可(獄), lit. "(the hell) 'Impossible'" (?), for *Avīci* in which *a-* obviously stands for an α-privativum; the semantic function of *ke* 可 I am, however, not able to explain.

2.1.1.2. Loan rendering (Lehnübertragung)

In a loan rendering (Haugen: approximate creation) the original word is still clearly recognizable in terms of content and – normally only partly – of form; it does not completely mirror the structure of the underlying original term. An example in OHG is *horsam*(*i*) for *oboediens*, "obedience," a word with a successful history in modern German: Gehorsam. Here the Lat. prefix *ob-* was not translated and the abstract nominal suffix *–sam*(*i*) was chosen instead of the present participle of the verb *horen*, "to hear."[60] Another example

---

hua 畫 representing *citra*(*ka*) and with *du* 度 as a translation of *pāra*, "the other side" (like *du* as a rendering for *pāramitā*).

[58] Dharmarakṣa is, however, inconsistent in his use, as he also has *jue* 決, "decide, determine" for *vyākaraṇa*.

[59] In *yixin-pingdeng* 一心平等 (Kumārajīva: *renshan* 忍善) for *samāhita* or *samādhi* in which *samā-* obviously has been rendered by *pingdeng* 平等.

[60] Betz 1974: 158; an exact loan translation is found in a text from the

is *deomuati* for *humilitas* which is composed of *dio*, "servant," and *muat*(*i*), "cast of mind," while the Latin abstract word is derived from *humilis*, "ordinary, low, humble." OHG *tagasprāhha*, lit. "day's speech, talk," as a translation for Lat. *homilia* is another example for this group. Loan renderings thus involve the greatest degree of creative freedom on the part of the translator or translators as he or they can, to a certain extent, ignore the form and the semantic basis of the original word as long as his or their new creation renders what is meant in the target language. Another example is *einsidil*, literally "who settles alone," for Gr. *anachorita* or Lat. *eremita*.[61]

What may be called hybrid renderings, because they use one transliterational and one semantic element which often clarifies the semantic field, belong to this group as well. Examples from OHG are, for example, *salmsang* for *psalterium*, or *fimfchust*(*i*) for *pentecoste*.[62]

I categorize in this group Chinese terms which still reflect a lexical element of the underlying Indic word, even if this is not always obvious and only reconstructable by following the semantic analysis which may underlie the rendering.

The translation *shangzhen* 上珍, literally meaning "excellent and rare," for *udāra*, "noble, illustrious," is rather an analytic rendering in which *shang* 上 obviously stands for *ud-*. Other examples are: *dade* 大德, "one of great virtue" (Kumārajīva: *fo* 佛) for *mahāmuni*, "great sage," or *mahāyaśas*, "one of great fame." In *jingyu* 境域, "border region," for *vidiś*(*a*), "intermediate quarter, region," *vi-* has obviously been taken as indicating distance and peripherality.

The translation *Lingjiu-shan* 靈鷲山, lit.: "spiritual vulture mountain," for *Gṛdhrakūṭa* may be counted in this category because it adds an element *ling* 靈 and rather loosely translates *kūṭa*, "peak," by the more generic *shan* 山, "mountain."

Reichenau: *gaganhorenti*.

[61] A direct loan translation is *waldlihher*; see Betz 1965: 39.

[62] See Betz 1965: 59, who also quotes the complete Anglo-Saxon translation *fiftigdæg*, literally "fifty-days."

One may also count into this group the rare examples where the translator(s) tried to harmonize between different versions of the text. One example I think I have found in Dharmarakṣa's *Lotus* is *ranzhuo* 染著, "tainted and attached" – Kumārajīva has the simplex *zhuo* 著 –, where the Kern edition has *sajjati* "to adhere, to stick to," but the Kashgar manuscript has *rajyati*, "to colour, to redden, to affect." It seems that the translator in the binom has tried a harmonization of two versions of the text.

Another example in this group is *ligou* 離垢, literally meaning "abandoned dust," for Skt. *vimala*, which is closer to the original than Kumārajīva's simpler *jing* 淨, "pure." See also Dharmarakṣa's *kongji* 空寂, lit.: "void-quiet," for the abstract *śūnyatā*, but on the other hand *kongwu* 空無, lit.: "void-nothing," for the adjective *śūnya* which rather belongs to the group of loan translations.

One could argue that the translation *jingxing* 經行, which literally may be rendered as "passing and walking," for (*anu*)*caṅkrama* belongs in this group as it seems to attempt, as a semantically redundant binom, to follow the reduplicating structure of the Indic original.

Even loan renderings which at first glance do not look very well chosen sometimes turn out to have a sound interpretational basis: when Dharmarakṣa has *dian-gui* 顛鬼, literally "jolted, fallen upside down ghost," for *apasmāraka*, which is usually taken to mean "ghost of oblivion" (: *apa-√smṛ-*), this does not look very close; but keeping in mind that *apasmāra* as a medical term also means "epilepsy, falling sickness" the picture changes and Dharmarakṣa's translation seems to be an ingenious loan rendering.[63]

Dharmarakṣa's decision to translate *kalyāṇamitra* by *shanshi* 善師, "good master, teacher" – where Kumārajīva has the regular *shanzhishi* 善知識 which should be categorized as a loan translation – is probably based on the fact that a *kalyāṇamitra* – like Upagupta for Aśoka – usually has the role of a teacher.

There are loan creations which became "standard": the word for hell, *diyu* 地獄, lit. "earthly prison," for *naraka* or *niraya* clearly

[63] The Song-dictionary *Fanyi-mingyi-ji* 翻譯名集 takes this as a translation for *piśāca* (T.2131.1086a.26ff.).

concentrates on a different semantic aspect than the Indic original terms and was used throughout the history of Buddhist translations as well as the rendering *egui* 餓鬼, lit.: "hungry ghost," for *preta*.

While *long* 龍, "dragon," for *nāga* belongs rather to the following group, Dharmarakṣa's *longxiang* 龍象, for *hastināga*, "elephant," based on an already established loan meaning *long* = *nāga*, should be grouped under this category.

It is not always certain if a term belongs to this group as we cannot be sure if it is really a translator's creation or if it was already a part of Chinese vocabulary which happens not to be documented in our extant sources. Dharmarakṣa's decision to use *kaishi* 開士 for *bodhisattva* – which he has taken over from earlier translators such as An Shigao 安世高 and Zhi Qian 支謙 – may represent such a case: so long as we do not know wether such a word was already in use before the earliest Buddhist Chinese documented example we cannot really say that it is a loan creation of the Buddhist translators. Later Buddhist explanations consider the word to be of Buddhist origin when they explain that it should mean "the gentleman who has an understanding of enlightenment."[64]

When Dharmarakṣa translates *piśāca* in a loan-translational way by *fanzu*-(*luocha*) 反足(羅剎), "inverted feet-(demon),"[65] he obviously had a certain traditional description of the *piśāca* in mind. Wether this was really how the Tang-period dictionary *Yiqiejing-yinyi* 一切經音義 by Huilin 慧琳 describes it, is a different matter.[66]

---

[64] *Yiqiejing-yinyi* 一切經音義, 2128.364b13開士(謂以法開道之士也…); see also 407a.13.

[65] Also found in his translation of the *Da-baoji-jing* 大寶積經 (T.310), *Yujialuoyue-wen-pusaxing-jing* 郁迦羅越問菩薩行經 (T.323), *Mieshifang-ming-jing* 滅十方冥經 (T.435), *Dafangdeng-dingwang-jing* 大方等頂王經 (T.477, where we find *fanzushou* 反足手, "feet and hands inverted"), *Xiuxing-daodi-jing* 修行道地經 (T.606).

[66] T.2128.376c15ff. 反足鬼(鬼名也。括地志云: 柔利國在一目國東為人一手足反,膝曲足居。上注云: 一手一脚反,卷曲也。東方朔神異經云: 西荒中有獸焉,其狀如鹿,人面,有牙,猴手,熊足,縱目,横鼻,反踵,饒力,佷惡,名曰: 惡物。此即鬼類也。) ("Inverted-feet-ghost. A name for a (spe-

For another kind of demons called *pūtana*, Dharmarakṣa also produces loan creations of different levels of complexity according to the characteristic features of this kind of ghosts: *goubian-hungui* 溝邊溷鬼, "dirty ghost on the side of the gulley," *hunce-gui* 溷廁鬼, "lavatory ghost," or *hunshen* 溷神 "dirty ghost," semantically inverting the expected analysis of *pūtana* as derived from √*pū*-, "to cleanse, to purify."

A similar case of loan creation is the continuously used *qunmeng* 群萌 for *sattvāni* or *prāṇin* where the Tang dictionary explains that *meng* 萌 is a synonym for *meng* 氓, "common people."[67]

As already mentioned, Indic prefixes could not be and did not always have to be translated into Chinese.[68] They sometimes but

---

cies of) ghosts: in the 'Geographical Records' (of the historiographies) it is said (in the section) about the kingdom of Rouli that to the east of a certain kingdom there are men with hands and feet inverted, with bent knees and inflexible feet. The above (mentioned) commentary stated that hand and feet are inverted and (people) are crimp. In the *Dongfang-shuoshen-yijing* it is said that in the deserts of the west there are beasts who look like deers, with faces of men, with tusks, hands like monkeys, feet like bears, vertical eyes and horizontal noses, inverted heels, with huge physical strength and malevolent; (they) are called 'monsters' and belong to the species of ghosts.")

[67] T.2128.431b.4群萌 (古文'氓'同'麥'；'耕'反'萌芽'也。『廣雅』萌始也。案'萌''冥昧皃' 也。言'眾庶無知'也。) ("Qunmeng: the old texts use it in the same way as '*men*;' spelt as '*mai*' + '*geng*;' means 'sprout;' in the Guangya it is (called) the beginning of the germination process. Accordingly '*meng*' (means) a dump fellow; also for common ignorant people."); see also 443b.17f. 群萌 ('萌''莫耕'反。『漢書集注』曰: '萌'謂: 草木初生也。『毛詩傳』曰: 羣眾也。言'童蒙凡夫'，猶彼眾小草也。又或字宜作'氓'。『毛詩傳』曰: '氓'民也。'氓'與'萌'同也。) ("Qunmeng: 'meng' spelt as '*mo*' + '*geng*.' The collected commentary of the Hanshu says, that '*meng*' is when grass and trees first sprout. In the *Maoshi-zhuan* it is explained as the crowd; ignorant common people, also for young grass. The character can also be written as '*meng*.' The *Maoshi-zhuan* says, that '*meng*' means '*min*' (people), and '*meng*' (people) is the same as '*meng*' (sprout).")

[68] In this respect Chinese differs from Tibetan where the translation of the Indic prefixes was standardized at an early point.

not consistently were rendered by special lexems which were obviously meant to express the semantic value of the Indic prefixes such as in *puman* 普滿 for *paripūrṇa*, where *pu-* 普 ("common, universal") seems to indicate completeness (*pari-*), while Kumārajīva's *chongman* 充滿 (lit.: "complete-full") translates the same word by a redundant binom.[69] Dharmarakṣa, every once in a while, seems to render a certain prefix by one Chinese lexeme, as for instance *shen* 甚 ("very, extremeley") for *abhi-* in *shenle* 甚樂 : *abhirati*, and in *shenman* 甚慢 : *abhimāna*. Another example would be *jie* 結 ("tie, knit") for *nir-* in *jiehen* 結恨 for *niṣkāṅkṣa* or *nirvicikitsa*, *jieqin* 結親 – not quite correct as an analysis of a Sanskrit word – for *niṣevamāṇa*, and *jiewang* 結網 for *niḥsaṃśayaṃ*. Or, more inconsistent because two prefixes are rendered with one Chinese lexeme (*chu* 出, "come out, raise") but still semantically correct, *chuxian* 出現 and *chuxing* 出興 for *utpadyate* and *chuzai* 出在 for *niṣkāsayitvā* / (manuscriptal) *niśkrrāmayitvā*.

That the omission of a literary rendering of prefixes was not seen necessarily as a defect of the translation may be deduced from the preface of the *Mahāvyutpatti*. Although Tibetan translation terminology almost regularly translates Indic prefixes it is stated there that prefixes only have to be translated when the meaning of the basic word – that is the *dhātu*, the root – is changed by it.[70]

---

[69] Another example is *chongmanyue* 充滿悅, lit.: "fully happy" (Kumārajīva: *xin'an juzu* 心安具足, lit.: "piece-of-mind-complete") for *saṃtoṣita* where *sam-* is probably expressed by *chong* 充, or the binomial *chongman* 充滿, "full, complete."

[70] See Simonsson 1957: 255: *pa ri daṅ / u pa lta bu la sogs te / tshig gi phrad daṅ rgyan lta bur 'byuṅ ba rnams bsgyur na don daṅ mthun źiṅ 'byor ba'i thabs ni / yoṅs su źe 'am / yaṅ dag pa źe 'am / ñe ba źes sgra bźin du sgyur cig / don lhag par sñegs pa med pa rnams ni tshig gi lhad gyis bsnan mi dgos kyis don bźin du thogs śig.* ("In case of the translation of *pari*, (*samyak*), *upa*, and single prefixes (which are used) like ornamentation (of the root) one should, in order (to achieve) accordance and agreement with the meaning, translate '*yoṅs su*' (complete = *pari*), '*yaṅ dag pa*' (real, entirely = *samyak*), or '*ñe ba*' (near = *upa*), according to the verbal shape (alone). In case that there is no achievement of additional meaning there is no need of adding one element but one should render

2.2. Loan meaning[71] *(Lehnbedeutung).*

Betz distinguishes a category of loan-meaning (Haugen: extension). A loan-meaning occurs when an original word in the target language adopts a new meaning and a different connotational semantic range by being used as a representative of one (or more) termini of the source language.

Thus an originally Germanic word like *geist* – which had such a strong impact on the German "Geistesgeschichte" from the 17th century onwards – started its "career" as a loan meaning, as it was already existent in Germanic languages before its use in a Christian context, meaning something like "mental movement, inner feeling." In Christian texts it was, however, used for Greek *pneuma* or Latin *spiritus* (originally for Hebrew *ruach*), which had, of course, from a doctrinal perspective, a completely different set of connotations. Another important loan meaning is the word for god, OHG *got* – already Goth. *guþ* –, which originally in Germanic languages was a neuter pluraletantum – **goðam*, **goðō* – and denoting rather lower divine beings but became used as a strong masculine noun for the Christian monotheistic God (Germ. **goðāz*), often used with attributes like (*al*)*waltant*, (*al*)*mahtīg*, Lat. *omnipotens*, in order to show the difference.

Dharmarakṣa's use of the pre-Buddhist terms *huaren* 化人 – which is already found in the *Liezi* 列子[72] and the *Guanyinzi* 關尹 子[73]

(lit.: take) it according to the meaning (of the root).")

[71] Or: loan-signifier?

[72] In the Tang-period this has been recognized and countered by the explanation that the Zhou king Mu 周穆王 had already been converted (*hua* 化) by Mañjuśrī (Wenshu 文殊) and Maudgalyāyana (Mulian 目連). See Daoshi's 道世 (second half of the seventh cent.) *Fayuan-zhulin* 法苑珠林 (T.2122.394b.20f.), repeated by the Song-scholar Baoyun's 寶雲 (1088–1158) *Fanyi-mingyi-ji* 翻譯名義集 (T.2131.1166c.29f.).

[73] 譬如化人，若有厭生死心，越生死心，止名為妖， 不名為道。("As for example the transformed man: he despises the spirit of birth and death, transcedes the spirit of birth and death, just calling it illusion but not calling it the Dao.")

– and *huaxiang* 化像 – found in the Huainanzi 淮南子[74] – for *nirmita*, "magically produced statue or man" belongs in this category.

This category thus comes closest to what is called *geyi* 格義 in Chinese Buddhist texts. Here it is certainly useful to keep in mind the distinction between "formal" and "conceptual loans" which Erich Zürcher made in his discussion of the terminological influence of Buddhism on early Daoist texts.[75] The two categories, although they certainly overlap, refer to the fact that in some cases words from an originally Chinese context are taken over just as, as it were, "empty cartridges" which are filled up with almost completely new Buddhist meaning.

I would argue, however, that even in the case of the usually quoted examples of *geyi* – *dao* 道, usually being taken as a translation for *bodhi*, and *wuwei* 無為, being a translation for *nirvāṇa*, *nirvṛta* or *nirvṛti*[76] – there may sometimes be some semantic reasoning for choosing them for rendering the Indic terms. In the case of *dao* there are enough examples where the term renders an Indic *yāna*[77] which semantically can only be derived from √*yā-* (*yāti*), "to move, to go." For *wuwei* one could argue as well that it was some analytic process that prompted the translation: *nirvṛta* or *nirvṛti*, "terminated, emancipated," could be taken, after all, in the meaning of "without action," derived again from *nir-*√*vṛt-* in a respective sense.[78]

---

[74] In the chapter Yuandao-xun 原道訓: 夫太上之道，生萬物而不有。成化像而弗宰。 ("Now the Dao of the Highest Heaven generates the ten thousand things but does not exist; it produces the transformation of appearances but does not regulate.")

[75] See Zürcher 1980.

[76] See the examples in Karashima 1998: 472f., s.v.

[77] Karashima 1998: 86f.

[78] From the standpoint of an early Prākṛt origin of the equation – see Gāndhārī *nivaṇa* (*nirvāṇa*), *nivudu* (*nirvṛta*), *nivrudi* (*nirvṛti*): Brough 1962: 302c – the derivational process was not as clear as in Skt. which, however, shows its own inconsistencies: *nir-*√*vā-*, *nir-*√*vṛ*(*t*)*-*. A Gāndhārī *nivaṇa* could, after all, well be interpreted as **nirvarṇa*, being derived from *nir-*√*vṛ-*. See also Norman 1994: 221ff., and 1997: 13.

It is in this group that we meet the bidirectional poly-semantic character of the terminology which strikes modern philologists as a feature of inconsistency in Chinese Buddhist translations. By poly-semantic I mean the fact that there is not a one-to-one correlation between the original term and the translation, and bidirectional points out the fact that there may be different renderings for the same Indic words, but also one Chinese translation term which renders more than one Indic original word.

We also find such cases in the Germanic languages. I only want to bring up the example of the word "soul" as a loan meaning – maybe originally a loan creation – for Lat. *anima*. It did not cover the whole range of use of *anima* which could also mean "life" in its physical and mental aspects – which usually is rendered by other words such as *līb* (Old-Saxon *līf*), which also means body, or *ferah* (spirit) – and OHG *sēla*, already Goth. *saiwala*, Old-Saxon *seola*, usually is used mainly for the soul in our modern religious sense, indicating individual transcedency.[79]

In the light of Indian grammatical and semantic analysis, however, such a poly-value is easily understood. Already the *Nighaṇṭu*-lists of synonymic expressions from the Veda, placed in front of Yāska's *Nirukta*, and Yāska's different explanation of the same word show this clearly. On the Buddhist side it is again the later *Mahāvyutpatti* which may shed some light on the underlying understanding:

> In respect to one expression several words (can be) understood.[80]

Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to discuss more general issues of the translation techniques used in and underlying early Chinese Buddhist translations. A scheme for arranging and analyzing the early Chinese translation vocabulary should raise an awareness of these different categories, and the terminological creativity may warn us not to discard some of the renderings as crude or even "false" be-

[79] Weisweiler, Betz 1974: 112f.

[80] *skad gcig la miṅ du mar 'dren pa ni* …; see Simonsson 1957: 250.

fore we try to understand why they were chosen by the translator in the first place. A correct interpretation of these early translation activities will not only throw light on some aspects of the history of Buddhist texts, especially those of early Mahāyāna, but will lay the foundation of a better understanding for the development and spread of Buddhism in India and beyond in the first centuries CE.

Bibliography

Backes, Herbert. 1982. *Die Hochzeit Merkurs und der Philologie. Studien zu Notkers Martian-Übersetzung*. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag.

Betz, Werner. 1965. *Deutsch und Lateinisch*. [2]Bonn. (First ed. 1949).

– 1974. "Lehnwörter und Lehnprägungen im Vor- und Frühdeutschen." In: Friedrich Maurer, Heinz Rupp (eds.), *Deutsche Wortgeschichte, Band I*, Berlin, New York (Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie 17/I): Walter de Gruyter: 135–163.

Boucher, Daniel. 1996. *Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China: A Study of Dharmarakṣa and His Translation Idiom*. University of Pennsylvania (PhD dissertation).

– 1998. "Gāndhārī and the Earliest Buddhist Translations Reconsidered: The Case of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118: 471–506.

– 2001. "The textual history of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*: Notes on its third century Chinese translation." *Sōka-daigaku-kokusai-bukkyōgaku-kōtō-kenkyūjo-nenpō Heisei 12 nendo/Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2000* 創價大學國際佛教學高等研究所年報平成 12 年度, No.4: 93–116.

– 2008. *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna. A Study and Translation of the Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-Sūtra*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2001. "Etymology and Magic: Yāska's Nirukta, Plato's Cratylus, and the Riddle of Semantic Etymologies." *Numen* 48: 147–203.

Brough, John. 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London, New York, Toronto.

– 1975. "Buddhist Chinese Etymological Notes." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 38: 581–585 (reprinted in Brough, John. 1996. *Collected Papers*. Hara Minoru, Wright, J.C. (eds.). London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London: 433–437.

Chen Shufen. 2004. *Rendition Techniques in the Chinese Translation of three Sanskrit Buddhist Scriptures*. Devon: Hardinge Simpole Publishing (Cambridge Buddhist Research Series 1).

Curtius, E.R. 1967. *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter.* [6]Bern, München: Francke.

Deeg, Max. 1995. *Die altindische Etymologie nach dem Verständnis Yāska's und seiner Vorgänger. Eine Untersuchung über ihre Praktiken, ihre literarische Verbreitung und ihr Verhältnis zur dichterischen Gestaltung und Sprachmagie*. Dettelbach: Verlag J.H. Röll (Würzburger Studien zur Sprache & Kultur 2).

– 1995b. "'Misunderstanding' in Translations of Sacred Texts – The Case of Old-High-German Bible Translations and Sino-Buddhist Sutra Translations." *Gokai: sono gengo-bunka-teki-shosō* 誤解その言語文化的諸相. Nagoya: Nagoya-Daigaku-Gengobunkabu (Nagoya-Daigaku-Gengobunkabu Tokutei-kenkyū-sirīzu 5 名古屋大学言語部特定ｼﾘｰｽﾞ): 165–185.

– 2004. "Bhagavat in Chinese Buddhist Translation: An Indirect Example of Oral Nirvacana in Buddhist Text Translations?" In: Sh. Hino, T. Wada (eds.). *Three Mountains and Seven Rivers. Prof. Musashi Tachikawa's Felicitation Volume*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass: 153–167.

Fo Guang Shan Foundation for Buddhist & Culture Education (ed.). 1999. *Buddhism Across Boundaries – Chinese Buddhism and the Western Regions. Collection of Essays 1993*. Sanchung: Foguang Cultural Enterprise Co., Ltd.

Fussman, Gérard. 1989. "Gandhārī écrite, Gandhārī parlée." In: Collette Caillat (ed.). *Dialectes dans les literatures Indo-Aryennes*. Paris: Collège de France: 433–501.

Harrison, Paul; South Coblin, W. 1999. "The Oldest Buddhist Incantation in Chinese? A Preliminary Study of the Chinese Transcriptions of the Mantra in the Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra." In: Fo Guang Shan Foundation for Buddhist & Culture Education 1999: 138–186.

Haugen, Einar. 1953. *The Norwegian Language in America, A Study in Bilingual Behavior.* Philadelphia.

Held, Axel. 1972. *Der buddhistische Mönch YEN-TS'UNG* (*557–610*) *und seine Übersetzungstheorie*. Köln (unpublished Inaugural Dissertation/ PhD dissertation).

Hinüber, Oskar von. 1983. "Sanskrit und Gāndhārī in Zentralasien." In: Klaus Röhrborn, Wolfgang Veenker (eds.). *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien* (*Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2.Juli bis 5.Juli 1981*). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz: 27–34.

Hunger, Herbert; Stegmüller, Otto; Erbse, Hartmut; Imhof, etc. 1988. *Die Textüberlieferung der antiken Literatur und der Bibel*. [2]München: Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag GmbH & Co. KG.

Itō Takanobu 伊藤隆寿. 1990. “Kakugi-bukkyō-kō – shoki-chūgoku-bukkyō no keisei” 格義仏教考初中国期仏教の形成 (“A Study of *Kê-i* 格義 Buddhism: The Formation of Early Chinese Buddhism“). Tōyō-gakuhō 東洋學報 71/3, 4: 57–89.

Ji Xianlin 季羡林. 1992. “Zai tan ‘futu’ yu ‘fo’” 再談「浮屠」與「佛」. *Chong-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 中華佛學學報 5: 19–30.

Kahrs, Eivind. 1998. *Indian semantic analysis – The ‘nirvacana’ tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 55).

Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋静志. 1993. *The textual study of the Chinese versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra – in the light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions*. Tokyo: Sankibō-busshorin 三喜房佛書林.

– 1994. *Chō-agon-kyō no gengo no kenkyū* (*Onshago-bunseki wo chūshin to-shite*) 『長阿含經』の原語の研究(音寫語分析を中心として). Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppansha 平河出版社.

– 1998. *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa’s Translation of the Lotus Sutra* 正法華經詞典. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica I).

– 1999. “Hokke-kyō no bunkengaku-teki-kenkyū (2) – Kannon Avalokitasvara no goi-kaishaku” 法華經の文獻的研究〔二〕– 觀音 Avalokitasvara 語義の解釋. *Sōka-daigaku-kokusai-bukkyōgaku-kōtō-kenkyūjo-nenpō Heisei 10 nendo/Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 1998* 創價大學國際佛教學高等研究所年報平成 10年度, No.2: 39–66.

– 2001. *A Glossary of Kumārajīva’s Translation of the Lotus Sutra* 妙法蓮華經詞典. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica IV).

– 2001b. “Some features of the language of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44: 207–230.

– 2002. “Miscellaneous notes on Middle-Indic words.” *Sōka-daigaku-kokusai-bukkyōgaku-kōtō-kenkyūjo-nenpō Heisei 13 nendo / Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2001* 創價大學國際佛教學高等研究所年報平成 13 年度, No.5: 147–152.

Karashima Seishi; Nattier, Jan. 2005. “*Qiuluzi* 秋露子, An Early Chinese Name for Śāriputra.” *Sōka-daigaku-kokusai-bukkyōgaku-kōtō-kenkyū-jo-nenpō Heisei 16 nendo/Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004* 創價大學國際佛教學高等研究所年報平成 16 年度, No.8: 361–376.

Kern, Hendrik, Nanjio Bunyiu. 1908–1912. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. St. Petersburg (Indian reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1992).

Kieschnick, John. 2003. *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture*. Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press.

King, Dan. 2008. *The Syriac Versions of the Writings of Cyril of Alexandria. A Study in Translation Technique*. Leuven: Peeters.

Köbler, Gerhard. 1994. *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. [4]Paderborn: Schoeningh (online-version used); http://homepage.uibk.ac.at/~c30310/ahdwbhin.html (last accessed: 28 December 2009)

Lai, Whalen. 1978. "Limits and Failure of *Ko-I* (Concept-Matching) Buddhism." *History of Religions* 18: 238–257.

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

Link, Arthur. 1961. "The Earliest Chinese Account of the Compilation of the 'Tripitaka' (II)." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 81/3: 281–299.

Man Mai Lai (Mai Man Lan). 2002. *Dharmarakṣa and His Work: The Impact of Central Asian Buddhist Thought in Translating Buddhist Texts in the Third to Fourth Century China*. Ann Arbor (UMI dissertation print; originally University of Wisconsin Madison 1994).

Nattier, Jan. 1990. "Church Language and Vernacular Language in Central Asian Buddhism." *Numen* 37/2: 195–219.

– 2003. "The Ten Epithets of the Buddha in the Translations of Zhi Qian 支謙." *Sōka-daigaku-kokusai-bukkyōgaku-kōtō-kenkyūjo-nenpō Heisei 14 nendo / Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002* 創價大學國際佛教學高等研究所年報平成 14 年度, No.6: 207–250.

– 2003b. *A few good men: The Bodhisattva Path according to The Inquiry of Ugra* (*Ugraparipṛcchā*). Honolulu: Hawai'i University Press.

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

Norman, K.R. 1994. "Mistaken ideas about *nibbāna*." In: Tadeusz Skorupski (ed.). *The Buddhist Forum III*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies: 211–225. (Reprinted in: Norman, K.R. 1996. *Collected Papers, Vol.VI*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society: 9–30).

– 1997. *A Philological Approach to Buddhism. The Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai Lectures 1994*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies (*The Buddhist Forum* 5).

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1983. "Stages of Transcription of Indian Words in Chinese from Han to Tang." In: Klaus Röhrborn, Wolfgang Veenker (eds.). *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien* (*Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2.Juli bis 5.Juli 1981*). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz: 73–102.

– 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

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

South Coblin, W. 1983. *A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses*. Hongkong: The Chinese University Press.

Simonsson, Nils. 1957. *Indo-Tibetische Studien. Die Methoden der tibetischen Übersetzer, untersucht im Hinblick auf die Bedeutung ihrer Übersetzungen für die Sanskritphilologie*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri.

Strauch, Ingo. 2007. "The Bajaur collection: A new collection of Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts – A preliminary catalogue and survey" (http://www.de/indologie/bajaur/publication/strauch_2007_1_0.pdf; accessed 28/01/2008).

T'ang Yung-Tung. 1951. "On 'Ko-Yi', the Earliest Method by which Indian Buddhism and Chinese Thought were synthesized." In: W. Ringe, et.al. (eds.). *Radhakrishnan – Comparative Studies in Philosophy Presented in Honour of his Sixtieth Birthday*. London: Allen & Unwin: 276–286.

Turner, Ralph L. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.

Vetter, Tillman; Zacchetti, Stefano. 2004. "On *Jingfa* 經法 in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations." *Sōka-daigaku-kokusai-bukkyōgaku-kōtō-kenkyūjo-nenpō Heisei 15 nendo / Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2003* 創價大學國際佛教學高等研究所年報平成 15 年度, No.7: 159–166.

Weisweiler, Josef; Betz, Werner. 1974. "Deutsche Frühzeit." In: Friedrich Maurer, Heinz Rupp (eds.), *Deutsche Wortgeschichte, Band I*, Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter (Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie 17/I).

Zacchetti, Stefano. 2005. *In Praise of the Light. A Critical Synoptic Edition with an Annotated Translation of Chapters 1–3 of Dharmarakṣa's Guang zan jing* 光贊經*, Being the Earliest Translation of the Larger Prajñāpāramitāsūtra*. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VIII).

Zürcher, Erich. 1977. "Late Han Vernacular Elements in the Earliest Buddhist Translations." *Journal of the Chinese Language Teacher's Association* 12/2: 177–203.

– 1980. "Buddhist Influence on Early Taoism – A Survey of Scriptural Evidence." *T'oung Pao* 66/1–3: 84–147.

– 1991. "A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts." In: Koichi Shinohara, Gregory Schopen (eds.), *From Benares to Beijing. Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-Hua*. Oakville, New York, London: 277–304.

– 1999. "Buddhism Accross Boundaries: The Foreign Input." In: Fo Guang Shan Foundation for Buddhist & Culture Education 1999: 2–59.