

‘To Be Smeared’ or ‘To Be Attached’? An Investigation of Sanskrit *lipyate kāmāiḥ* and Pāli *lippiati kāmesu* in Light of Their Chinese Translations

Francesco Barchi

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (LMU), Germany

Abstract In Buddhist translated literature, the Chinese expression *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 (not attached to desires) is apparently used as variant of the passive construction *bù wéi yù suǒ rǎn* 不為欲所染 (not tainted by desires) to translate the same Sanskrit source expression *na lipyate kāmāiḥ* (not being smeared by desires). An Indic parallel closer to *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲, namely *na lippati kāmesu* (not being attached to desires), is found in Pāli and in some Hybrid sources. This paper argues that the Sanskrit and Pāli forms can be traced back to a common archetype akin to the Pāli form and that the *-ya*-present *lipyate* was originally used as a class IV intransitive present. Owing to use of the historical instrumental suffix *-ehi* as a generalised oblique plural ending in Middle Indo-Aryan, the form *lipyate kāmehi* (< **lipyate kāmesu*) was eventually reanalysed as a present passive. The two variants found in Chinese translations bear witness to the semantic and grammatical ambiguity underlying the Indic source expression.

Keywords Chinese Buddhist translations. Pāli. Buddhist Sanskrit. Passive constructions. Oblique plural.

Summary 1 Introduction. – 2 Passive Constructions in Indo-Aryan and Chinese. – 2.1 Passive Constructions in Indo-Aryan. – 2.2 Passive Constructions in Chinese. – 3 *Bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲: A Passive Construction?. – 4 A Broader Focus. – 5 The Elusive Meaning of *lipyate/lippiati*. – 5.1 The Indo-Aryan Root *lip-*: Meaning and Case-Marking. – 5.2 Diachronic Development: From Locative to Instrumental. – 6 How Was the Expression Understood by Translators?. – 7 Conclusion.



Peer review

Submitted 2023-09-24
Accepted 2024-02-24
Published

Open access

© 2024 Barchi | © 4.0



Citation Barchi, F. (2024). “‘To Be Smeared’ or ‘To Be Attached’?”. *Bhasha*, 3(1), [1-46].

1 Introduction

For the scholar who wishes to research Buddhist Chinese, the language of Buddhist translated literature presents a series of challenges pertaining to every domain of the linguistic system. As regards the grammatical dimension, a common problem one has to face is that some grammatical features of the Indic source text might emerge in the Chinese translation. Using a metaphorical expression borrowed from translation studies (Teich 2003, 22), the linguistic shape of the Indic source text tends to 'shine through' the translated *sūtra* making the language of translated texts appear different from coeval literature composed in standard literary Chinese.¹ The distortive influence of the Indic source text is particularly evident in early translations, often characterized by a hyper-overt rendition of the original text into an obscure variety of Chinese almost incomprehensible without resorting to the Indic parallels.²

A philological approach to the linguistic investigation of translated *sūtras* generally allows one to avoid the possible pitfalls in the grammatical analysis of this typology of texts: in most cases, the comparison of the Chinese translations with the extant Indic parallels, when available, provides the key to the exact grammatical interpretation of the Chinese texts. Notwithstanding, in certain cases the mere comparison with the parallels does not suffice for the correct analysis. The study of the Chinese Buddhist translations often requires a deeper philological and linguistic analysis of a specific expression or passage, unfolding the various diachronic and textual layers underlying the use of a certain grammatical feature. In this paper, I intend to use the Chinese expression *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 and its Indic, Chinese and Tibetan parallels as a case study to illustrate the linguistic and philological factors underlying the grammatical analysis of the Chinese Buddhist translations. I argue that the alternation between *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 and the passive construction *bù wéi yú suǒ rǎn* 不為欲所染 found in synchrony in Chinese translations

This article is an adaptation of a paper presented at LMU University of Munich on 22 October 2021 as a part of the workshop *Buddhism and Language: A Twofold Perspective: The Role of Language in Buddhist Teachings and the Role of Buddhist Sources in Linguistic Research*. I thank the participants of the workshop for their helpful feedback, in particular Stefan Baums and Niels Schoubben. I am indebted to Zhang Yiren and Benedikt Peschl for valuable remarks on a draft version of the article. I also want to thank Kelsey Martini for 'polishing' my English.

1 For an introduction to language contact through-translation, see Kranich 2009; 2014; Kranich, Becher, Höder 2011; Baumgarten, Özçetin 2008; Becher, House, Kranich 2009. On Chinese Buddhist translations as a locus of grammatical interference, see Barchi (forthcoming).

2 See Zacchetti 2007 for a detailed discussion of Ān Shigāo's 安世高 (fl. ca. 148-80, being the first translator mentioned in Chinese historical sources) translation technique.

to translate the same source form is motivated by the semantic and morpho-syntactic ambiguity of the Indic expression, reflected in the opposition between the two patterns *na lippati kāmesu* and *na lipyate kāmāiḥ/kamehi* found in the extant Indic parallels.

The paper is organized as follows. In § 2, I briefly introduce passive constructions in Indo-Aryan (2.1) and Chinese (2.2). In § 3, I introduce the expression *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 and present the use of the verb *rǎn* 染 in Chinese. In § 4, I discuss the Chinese occurrences of *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 attested in the Taishō Canon and compare them to their Indic parallels. In § 5, I describe the meaning and use of the verb *lipyate/lippati* in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan (5.1); I suggest that *lipyate/lippati* served as a class IV intransitive present and that the instrumental plural *kāmāiḥ/kamehi* found in Buddhist Sanskrit ultimately continues a Middle Indo-Aryan oblique plural form used as a locative (5.2). In § 6, I argue that the Chinese and Tibetan translators were aware of the semantic and grammatical ambiguity of *lipyate kāmāiḥ/kāmehi* and, therefore, specific translation strategies were used to convey the intransitive or passive meaning. In § 7 I summarise the results.

2 Passive Constructions in Indo-Aryan and Chinese

In the preceding section, 'passivity' was mentioned in reference to both Indo-Aryan and Chinese. At the outset, it seems appropriate to provide a definition of 'passive construction' in their respective domains and with respect to the relevant chronological framework. Despite containing features typical of constructions falling within the 'passive continuum', both Indo-Aryan and Chinese passives present distinct features.³ We might want to start the discussion with Indo-Aryan, as the situation is more straightforward than in Chinese.

2.1 Passive Constructions in Indo-Aryan

In Old Indo-Aryan (OIA, i.e. Vedic),⁴ finite passives are typically expressed within all the tense systems by means of 'characterized formations', distinguishing passives from bare middles (Kulikov 2006, 63). Early Vedic presents three different formations typically employed in passives: the 'passive aorist' in *-i* and *-ran*, the 'stative' in

³ For a typological account of the notion of passivity see Abraham 2006; Comrie 1988; Haspelmath 1990; Kazenin 2001; Kulikov 2011; Shibatani 1985; 2004 *inter alia*.

⁴ For a periodization of Indo-Aryan, see Dahl 2016, 69 fn. 7; Masica 1993, 51-3; Bubenik 1996, x.

-e and -re (Kümmel 1996) and the present passives with the accented suffix in -yá-. Since the latter is the only formation still productive in Early Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA), I will not deal with the passive aorist and the stative.⁵ The creation of a passive paradigm through the suffix -yá-, a specialization of the Proto-Indo-European intransitive suffix *-ie/o- is one of the main innovations of the Indo-Aryan verbal system (Fortson 2010, § 5.32, § 10.18). The suffix is used in the present system as a whole, including, therefore, three tenses – present, imperfect, future – and four categories of the *modus irrealis* – injunctive, subjunctive (disappearing in Early MIA), imperative and optative (Kulikov 2006, 69; Gotō 2013, § 3.7.5). Present passives are built by attaching the accented suffix -yá- to the root in the zero grade. The suffix -ya- is also used to build a class of intransitive verbs, traditionally called class IV; as a norm, the verbs belonging to this class are also built by attaching the suffix to the root in the zero grade, but the accent is placed on the root and not on the suffix. Present passives are inflected with middle endings, whereas -ya-presents can take both active and middle endings (Kulikov 1998a, 144; 2012, 4; Hock 2022).

Old Indo-Aryan also inherited the formation of a category of verbal adjectives built through the suffixes *-tá- and *-ná- (-tá- and -ná- in OIA) from Indo-Iranian, itself inherited from Proto-Indo-European *-tó- and *-nó-, indicating a completed action (Szemerényi 1996, § 9.6.14; Fortson 2010, § 5.61; Gotō 2013, § 3.8.3).⁶ As is the case with -yá-passives, the -tá-/ná- suffix is attached to the root in the zero grade. The -ta participle can serve as the verbal head of a clause, in particular when accompanied by a copular verb, with the copula typically not appearing in the third person present (Macdonell 1916, § 208; Jamison 1990; Dahl 2016, 73). Another type of verbal adjective, generally called 'gerundive' (Gotō 2013, § 3.8.4), is also relevant to Indo-Aryan passive constructions. In Vedic the main gerundive formation is built with the suffix -ya-, gerundives in -enya-, áyya-, and -tva- are also attested. The other two widespread gerundive suffixes of Classical Sanskrit – i.e. -tavyà- and -anīya- – are attested but at first only marginally employed from Early Middle Vedic onwards finding greater attestation in later texts (Delbrück 1888, 396-402; Jamison 1984, 610; Gotō 2013, 141). The morpho-syntactic status of the gerundive is comparable to that of the -ta participle: as a verbal adjective it has a strong nominal character, but it can also be used as the verbal head of a clause accompanied by a copula.

⁵ Only few traces of the passive aorist in -i are preserved in Pāli (von Hinüber 2001, 462; Geiger 1916, 177; Oberlies 2019, 93).

⁶ See Luraghi, Inglese, Kölligan 2021 for a survey of the inflectional and derivational processes, as well as the periphrastic formations, underlying the passive voice encompassing all the branches of the Indo-European language family.

The three formations (finite passive, *-ta* participle and gerundive) share the fact that with transitive verbs they show O-orientation with verbal agreement between the nominative patient and the verb, or the verbal head in case of the verbal adjectives, whereas the agent, if expressed, is demoted to the oblique case, i.e. the instrumental, but also the genitive for the *-ta* participle and the genitive and the dative for the gerundive (at least in Early Vedic, see Hock 1986). The OIA O-oriented constructions can thus be exemplified with the following examples (after Hock 1986, 15):

(1)

a. **Present passive**

devadattena kaṭaḥ kriyate
Devadatta:INS mat:NOM make:PRS.PASS.3SG
'By Devadatta a mat is being made'.*

b. **-ta participle**

devadattena kaṭaḥ kṛtaḥ
Devadatta:INS mat:NOM made:NOM
'By Devadatta a mat has been made'.

c. **Gerundive**

devadattena kaṭaḥ kartavyaḥ
Devadatta:INS mat:NOM make:GRND.NOM
'By Devadatta a mat is to be made'.

* The glosses used in this paper generally follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules (<https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf>). In distinction from them, in Sanskrit glosses, an equal sign '=' indicates unresolved sandhi.

In Pāli, the present passive is still a productive category; however, in distinction from OIA, the opposition with the present active is only shown by the stem and not also by the ending, with the bare middle surviving only in some forms and its function partially taken over by the causative and passive (von Hinüber 2001, 414-15; Geiger 1916, 176; Oberlies 2019, 318-20). Historical forms resulting from the development that the *-yá-* suffix underwent during the passage from OIA to MIA are largely preserved. Formally, there is no morphological distinction between such historical passives and inherited class IV presents: with roots ending in consonant, passives and class IV presents both show assimilation of the semivowel *-y-* of the suffix to the preceding consonant (Geiger 1916, 136), e.g. *vuccati* 'is being said' < OIA *ucyate* and *kuppati* 'shakes' < OIA *kupyate*. New passive stems are also formed by the addition of the suffix *-īya-*; in certain cases, 'double passives' are even formed by adding the passive suffix to a passive stem (von Hinüber 2001, 458; Geiger 1916, 175; Oberlies 2019, 92).

The active/passive opposition by means of mere stem alternation in Pāli is exemplified in (2).

(2)

a. **Present active**

yo jānanto pāpakammaṃ karoti
REL:NOM know:PTCPL.PRS.NOM evil.action:ACC do:PRS.3SG
'One who commits evil actions consciously'. (Mil 84.13-14)

b. **Present passive**

sace kho pana karoto kariyati pāpaṃ
if indeed but do:PTCPL.PRS.GEN do:PASS.PRS.3SG evil:NOM
'If bad things happen (lit. are done) to one who does [bad things]'. (AN
I.3.65.17)

As regards the other two O-oriented constructions, Pāli largely employs both the verbal adjective in *-(i)ta/-na-* and the gerundive. The verbal adjective is preserved to a great extent in historical forms, even though the connection with the present stem has often been made opaque by phonological changes (von Hinüber 2001, 492-4; Geiger 1916, 197-8; Oberlies 2019, 107-11). The gerundive presents a series of suffixes, both continuing the OIA suffixes and abstracted from the inherited historical forms (von Hinüber 2001, 495-6; Geiger 1916, 197-8; Oberlies 2019, 100-5). The case syntax of the three Pāli O-oriented constructions is substantially the same as OIA (von Hinüber 2022, 113, 234).

The situation in Gāndhārī is akin to Pāli: inherited present passive forms occur along with innovative forms based on the present stem and the productive suffix *-iya-* (Baums 2009, 231). The majority of *-ta* participles and gerundives are continuants of the OIA forms, but innovative forms based on the present stem are also attested (234-6).⁷

⁷ The Gāndhārī variety used as the administrative language of the kingdom of Kroraina in the southeastern region of the Tarim Basin in the third to fourth centuries CE, generally known as Niya Prakrit, exhibits the systematic use of an extended form of the past passive participle in *-taka-* instead of the *-ta* participle (Burrow 1937, 93, 110-15). The origin of such formation presumably lies in the use of the inherited *-ta* participle as the basis of an innovative A-oriented periphrastic past construction and the consequent functional ambiguity of the inherited OIA past participle, see Jamison 2000; Barchi, Peschl 2022.

2.2 Passive Constructions in Chinese

The 'passive' definition has been applied to a wide range of constructions in Archaic and Middle Chinese⁸ with different behavioural features and distinct diachronic development (Pän 1982, 247-55; Peyraube 1989; Pulleyblank 1995, 35-8; Wáng 2014, 405-22; Wèi 1994; Yáng, Hé 2001, 668-97 *inter alia*). Here, I focus only on those constructions characterized by the overt presence of grammatical markers. Therefore, I do not take into consideration those alternations of verb orientation either unmarked (such as in labile verbs) or motivated by phonological and morphological variation of the verb (see Xu 2006, 62-76 for an overview). I do not address those verbs, such as *kě* 可 (to be able), *zú* 足 (to be sufficient), *nán* 難 (to be difficult) and *yì* 易 (to be easy), typically entailing 'patient subjects' (Wáng 2014, 406).

At least three different constructions with overt marking are commonly described as passives, namely the *jiàn* 見 construction, the *wéi* 為 construction and a type of construction occurring with one of a set of 'transitive inactive verbs' with the meaning of 'to undergo' or 'to receive' (Haspelmath 1990, 40) such as *zāo* 遭, *méng* 蒙, *shòu* 受 and *bèi* 被, the latter representing the source for the Mandarin passive construction (Li, Thompson 1981, 492). Each of these can be divided into different subtypes depending on various parameters, such as the presence of an overt agent and the use of other additional markers. All the constructions originated through the grammaticalization of original verbs, even though the synchronic status of these verbs in each stage of development is much disputed. It appears that one of the conditions that allowed the grammaticalization of these transitive verbs into passive markers was their 'inward semantic meaning' (Zeng 2020, 278), in that they entail the transmission of force from a patient to an agent (cf. Chao 2011, 711).

We might want to start with the earliest attested construction (Yáng, Hé 2001, 668), namely the *jiàn* 見 construction. The verb *jiàn* possesses a full lexical meaning denoting visual perception, but it is semantically and pragmatically not neutral, being non-volitional, uncontrollable and unintentional, which are traits typically associated with 'passive' experiencers (Zeng 2020, 118; cf. Peyraube 1989, 341). The non-volitional and uncontrollable nature of *jiàn*, the association with a 'passive' experiencer, and the 'inward orientation' of the verb were presumably the basis for a semantic extension of the verb from visual perception to a more general meaning of 'to experience' and 'to encounter', see (3).

⁸ In this paper, I follow Aldridge's (2013a, 40) periodization of Chinese. I provide a tentative chronology of the quoted sources example by example (based on Zeng 2020, 7).

(3) 盆成括見殺。

Pén Chéngkuò jiàn shā

Pen Chengkuo encounter kill

'Pen Chengkuo was killed (lit. encountered killing)'. (*Mèngzǐ*, Jìn xīn II, fourth-third c. BCE)*

* Before continuing the discussion, I would like to introduce the Chinese corpus used in this paper. All the examples from Chinese Buddhist texts are quoted from the Taishō Edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon (Taishō Shinshū Daizokyo, hereafter = T, ed. Takakusu, Watanabe 1924-32) as contained in the CBETA electronic corpus 《大正新脩大藏經》中華電子佛典協會電子資料庫 (<https://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw/zh/>). Non-Buddhist Chinese examples are quoted from *Zhōngguó zhéxué shū diànzǐhuà jìhuà* 中國哲學書電子化計劃 (Chinese Text Project; ed. Sturgeon 2011).

The second type of construction is built with the dynamic copula *wéi* 為 (cf. Peyraube, Wiebusch 1994), originally expressing a change of state (Wèi 1994; Zeng, Anderl 2019) see (4a). The *wéi* construction can also occur with the nominalizer *suǒ* 所 marking the element taken by the copula, see (4b).⁹

(4)

a. 止，將為三軍獲。

zhǐ, jiāng wéi sān jūn huò

stop will COP three army capture

'[If] you stop, [you] will be captured by the three armies (lit. become what is captured by the three army)'. (*Zuǒzhuan*, Xiāng Gōng 18, fifth-fourth c. BCE)

b. 負石自投於河，為魚鱉所食。

fù shí zì tóu yú hé,

carry stone self throw in river

wéi yú biē suǒ shí

become fish turtle NMLZ eat

'Carrying a stone, [he] jumped into the river, becoming the food of fishes and turtles (lit. what is eaten by fishes and turtles)'. (*Zhuāngzǐ*, Dào Zhí, fourth-third c. BCE)

⁹ The introduction of the nominalizer *suǒ* to mark the constituent following *wéi* has been linked by Aldridge (2013b, 66) to the loss of affixional morphology marking embedded nominalization in Late Archaic Chinese. In other words, the use of *suǒ* in the *wéi* construction would have arisen to overtly mark that the constituent following *wéi* was nominal. Despite not being substantiated with direct evidence, Aldridge's proposal is certainly intriguing, because it provides a functional explanation for the emergence of the use of *suǒ* in the *wéi* construction.

The third type of construction occurs with verbs with the meaning of 'to undergo' or 'to suffer' such as *bèi* 被, see (5a). The original nominal status of the object of the verb *bèi* in Archaic Chinese can be observed by the presence in certain instances of the genitive marker *zhī* 之 between the object of the verb and the agent of the action-noun serving as the object of the verb, namely *zèn* 讟 (object) and *zhòng kǒu* 眾口 (agent) in (5b), clearly marking an adnominal relationship (Zeng 2020, 172 ff.).

(5)

a. 今兄弟被侵。

jīn xiōngdì bèi qīn
now brothers suffer attack

'[If his] brothers have now to undergo an attack..'. (*Hán Fēizǐ*, Wǔ dù, fifth-third c. BCE)

b. 被眾口之。

bèi zhòng kǒu zhī zèn
suffer many mouth gen slander

'[He] suffered slander from a large number of people (lit. slander of a large number of people)'. (*Hán Fēizǐ*, Jiānjié shìchén)

Although deriving from verbs with different meanings and having different paths to grammaticalization, the various passive constructions (*jiàn*, *wéi*, transitive inactive verbs) present a significant degree of syntactic convergence in Middle Chinese. For instance, a common phenomenon which represents an innovative feature at this stage of development is the presence of postverbal material after the verbal forms serving as the object of the passive verbs (Ān 2009, 135; Liú 1992, 319 ff.; Peyraube 1989, 354; Wáng 2014, 415), see the following examples in (6) quoted from Buddhist texts.¹⁰

(6)

a. 必見毀辱神廟。

bì jiàn huǐrǔ shénmiào
certainly suffer revile temple

'[I] will certainly **suffer** the reviling of **the temple**'. (T 200, 254a24-5)^{*}

* *Zhuànjí bǎi yuán jīng* 撰集百緣經 (T 200), being a Chinese translation of the *Avadānaśataka*. The Taishō Canon attributes it to *Zhī Qiān* 支謙 (fl. 223-53), but this ascription is suspect. It probably represents a later translation (sixth c. CE), see Demoto 1995.

¹⁰ The presence of postverbal complements after the putative action nouns is hardly compatible with analysing the objects of the passive verbs as nouns. Against this background, a process of reanalysis of the construction can be envisaged, postulating the

- b. 如我昔為歌利王割截身。

rú wǒ xī wéi Gēlì wáng gējié shēntǐ
like I formerly COP Kalinga king cut body

'Like when in a past time the king Kalinga cut my body [into pieces] (lit. to me the King Kalinga cut **the body**)'. (T 235, 750b14-5)*

* *Jīngāng bānrě boluómì jīng* 金剛般若波羅蜜經 (T 235), Kumārajīva's (ch. Jiūmóluóshí 鳩摩羅什, 344-413) transl. of the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*, translated in 403 CE.

- c. 如彼愚人被他打頭。

rǔ bǐ yúrén bèi tā dǎ tóu
like that foolish.person suffer other hit head

'Like that foolish man getting hit in the head by other people (lit. **suffering** other people hitting **the head**)'. (T 209, 543b18)*

* *Bǎiyú jīng* 百喻經 (T 209), translated into Chinese by Guṇavarḍdhi (ch. Qíunàpídì 求那毘地) in 492 CE.

A last type of construction needs to be introduced before proceeding with the discussion. It has been commonly argued that another passive construction attested in Archaic Chinese features the use of the preposition *yú* 於 to mark the agent of the passive verb (Pān 1982, 247; Peyraube 1989, 336; Wáng 2014, 407), see (7).

- (7) 勞心者治人, 勞力者治於人。

láo xīn zhě zhì rén, láo
work mind NMLZ govern people work

lì zhě zhì yú rén
strength NMLZ govern by people

'Those who labour with their minds rule others, those who labour with their strength are ruled **by others**'. (*Mèngzǐ*, Téng Wén Gōng I)

The passive interpretation of *yú* in such instances has been disputed. As a matter of fact, the preposition *yú* does not only introduce agents, but most commonly locative complements (Pulleyblank 1986) as in (4b) above and in (8), as well as a rather wide range of other complements, including different types of undergoers (patient, recipient, benefactive, see Méi 2018, 296; Zeng 2020, 257 ff.).

reinterpretation of the object of the passive verbs from action nouns or nominalized verb-phrases (see the use of *suǒ*) into sentential objects (Aldridge 2013b; Anderl 2017, 692). From this perspective, considering the object of the passive verbs as embedded clauses would explain the presence of postverbal complements in the construction, as the verbal element serves as the verb of an embedded clause. A similar syntactic analysis has been also proposed for the Mandarin passive construction, see Hashimoto 1988.

- (8) 王立於沼上。
wáng lì yú zhǎo shàng
king stand at pond above
'The king was standing above the pond'. (Mèngzǐ, Liáng Huì Wáng I)

As concluded by Zeng (2020, 265), the passive interpretation of examples such as (7) mainly relies on the context of the sentence rather than on the use of *yú*, which in Late Archaic Chinese appears to have developed into an oblique marker “indicating an ‘indirect/loose/marginalized’ relationship or some other additional information (e.g., location, agent, object of comparison)” (see also Méi 2018, 298-9 for similar considerations). In any case, the use of *yú* to mark agents in the so-called ‘passive *yú* construction’ is hardly attested in post-Qin sources (second c. BCE).

3 *Bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲: A Passive Construction?

In the middle of the second chapter of Kumārajīva’s translation of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* (*Móhē bānrě bōluómì jīng* 摩訶般若波羅蜜經, T 223), one encounters the following passage:

- (9) 是菩薩摩訶薩不染於欲。
shì púsà móhēsà bù rǎn yú yù
that bodhisattva mahāsattva NEG taint in/by desire
'That *bodhisattva mahāsattva* is not tainted in/by (?) desire'. (T 223, 221b20-1)

At first glance, the grammatical function of *yú* in (9) with respect to the semantic role introduced by it (location vs. agent) is not very clear. Thus, one can compare the passage with its Sanskrit parallel (I am using here the Nepalese recension of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*) and with the other Chinese translations of the *sūtra*, see (10).¹¹

- (10)
a. *na* *punar* *bodhisattvo*
NEG but bodhisattva:NOM
mahāsattvaḥ *kāmaguṇair* *lipyate*
great.being:NOM desire.quality:INS.PL smear:PRS.PASS.3SG
'A bodhisattva great being is not **smeared by the qualities of desire**'. (Pañca 37.8-9)*

¹¹ There are six Chinese translations of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*. The two earliest ones were temporally produced close to each other (late third c. CE) and were made by Mokṣala (ch. Wúchǎluó 無叉羅) in 291 CE and Dharmarakṣa (ch. Zhū Fǎhù 竺法護)

* The Gilgit manuscript version of *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* (Zacchetti 2005, 387.17r7-9) reads: [*bodhisattvā mahāsattvā*] *na ca taiḥ* [*paṃcabhiḥ kāmagaṇaiḥ*] *sārdhaṃ saṃvasanti na lipyamte*.

b. 無所沾污。

wú suǒ zhānwū

NEG NMLZ smear

'There is no smearing'. (T 221, 4c14, translated by Mokṣala)

c. 其菩薩摩訶薩不為五欲之所沾污。

qí púsà móhēsà bù wéi

that bodhisattva mahāsattva NEG COP

wǔ yù zhī suo zhānwū

five desire GEN NMLZ smear

'That *bodhisattva mahāsattva* is **not smeared by the five desires**'. (T 222, 152a10-11, transl. by Dharmarakṣa)

d. 不為五欲之所染污。

bù wéi wǔ yù zhī suǒ rǎnwū

NEG COP five desire GEN NMLZ smear

'[That *bodhisattva mahāsattva*] is not smeared by the five desires'. (T 220, 11b15-16, transl. by Xuánzàng)

As one can see from the comparison with the parallels, the Sanskrit text reads a finite present passive (i.e. *lipyate*) with a non-animate instrumental agent (i.e. *kāmagaṇair*); Dharmarakṣa's and Xuánzàng's translations both present the passive construction *wéi* 為 A *zhī suǒ* 之所 V. In the light of the grammatical formations in the Sanskrit and Chinese parallels, one might conclude that the use of *yú* in Kumārajīva's translation represents an instance of the Archaic Chinese 'passive' construction with the agent introduced by the preposition.

As introduced in § 2.2, however, this type of construction died out at a relatively early stage and therefore it is very unusual to find it in Middle Chinese. As a matter of fact, in pre-Qin texts, the syntagm *rǎn yú* 染於 mainly occurs in *Mòzǐ* 墨子 (fifth-third c. BCE), where it is

in 286 CE, namely *Fàngguāng bānrě jīng* 放光般若經 (T 221) and *Guāngzàn jīng* 光讚經 (T 222). The *sūtra* was translated a third time in 404 by Kumārajīva. The remaining three translations are by Xuánzàng (translated during 660-63 CE) and reflect the later subdivision of the text in the three versions (*Śatasāhasrikā*, *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*, *Aṣṭadaśasāhasrikā*), being the first three divisions (ch. *huì* 會 or *fēn* 分) of Xuánzàng's monumental work in 600 fascicles, i.e. *Dà bānrě bōluómíduō jīng* 大般若波羅蜜多經 (T 220, vols 5-7, see Zacchetti 2015, 189). The example in the main text is quoted from Xuánzàng's translation of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* (i.e. the second division, found in vol. 7).

used with the meaning of 'to dye in', as in (11a), and, by means of semantic extension, with the sense of 'to be under the influence of', with *yú* introducing the person under whose influence one is, as in (11b).

(11)

- a. 染於蒼則蒼，染於黃則黃。

rǎn yú cāng zé cāng, rǎn yú huáng zé huáng
dye in blue CONJ blue dye in yellow CONJ yellow

'What is **died in blue** becomes blue, what is dyed in yellow becomes yellow'.
(*Mòzǐ, Suǒ rǎn*)

- b. 舜染於許由、伯陽。

Shùn rǎn yú Xǔ Yóu Bó Yáng

Shun be_under_influence in Xu You Bo Yang

'Shun **came under the influences** of Xu You and Bo Yang'. (*Mòzǐ, Suǒ rǎn*)

In post-Qin sources, the syntagm *rǎn yú* 染於 is frequently employed and occurs almost only in Buddhist texts. See for instance example (12a) quoted from Kumārajīva's translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (*Wéimójié suǒshuō jīng* 維摩詰所說經, T 475). As also shown from the comparison with the Sanskrit parallel in (12b) (cf. Sk. LOC.SG. *dharme*), in this case the preposition *yú* clearly introduces a locative noun-phrase, while the meaning of the verb seems to have a 'to cling on, to be attached' semantic nuance (cf. *rǎnzhuó* 染著 'clinging').¹²

(12)

- a. 若染於法乃至涅槃，是則染著，非求法也。

ruò rǎn yú fǎ nǎizhì nièpán,
if be_attached to dharma so_much_as nirvāṇa

shì zé rǎnzhuó fēi qiú fǎ yě
that CONJ clinging NEG seek dharma FIN

'If one **is attached to a dharma**, so much as the *nirvāṇa*, that is clinging, it is not seeking the Dharma'. (T 475, 546a16-17)

¹² Xuánzàng's translation of the parallel (T 476, 570b16-17) also shows the use of *yú* to introduce a locative complement, but in this case it is fronted before the verb: *ruò yú zhū fǎ nǎizhì nièpán shǎoyǒu tānrǎn, shì qiú tānrǎn, fēi wèi qiú fǎ* 若於諸法乃至涅槃少有食染，是求食染，非謂求法 (If one had the faintest attachment **to a dharma**, as much as the *nirvāṇa*, that would be seeking attachment, it would not be seeking the Dharma). The Tibetan translation of the passage (quoted from SGBSL 2004, 222) reads: *de la gang dag chos gang la chags na tha na mya ngan las 'das pa la yang rung ste, de dag ni chos 'dod pa ma yin gyi, de dag ni 'dod chags kyi rdul 'dod pa'o* (He who is attached to anything, even to liberation, is not interested in the Dharma but is interested in the taint of desire; transl. by Thurman 1976, 50).

b.	<i>tatra</i>	<i>ye</i>	<i>kvacid</i>	<i>dharme</i>	<i>rakṣante</i>	
	there	REL:NOM.PL	INDF:LOC	dharmā:LOC	heed:PRS.3PL	
	<i>'ntaśo</i>	<i>nirvāṇe</i>	<i>'pi,</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>dharmārthikāḥ,</i>
	so_much_as	liberation:LOC	also	NEG	3PL:NOM	dharmā.wanting:NOM.PL
	<i>rajo'rthikās</i>		<i>te</i>			
	taint.wanting:NOM.PL		3PL:NOM			

'In which case those who **are passionate** * **about any dharma whatsoever**, even about final release, are not those who want the Dharma, they are those who want the stain of passion'. (Vikn 5.3, transl. by Gómez, Harrison 2022, 62)

* Both the anonymous reviewers aptly pointed out that Sk. *rakṣante*, lit. 'heed', appears to be out of context at least, and that the Chinese (染) and Tibetan (*gnas*, see also example 29c below) translations rather point to such a verb as **rajyante*, which also forms a good word-play on the *rajas* in the closely following compound *rajorthikās* (see Huáng 2011, 170 fn. 4 for the same conclusion). Thus, one is probably dealing with a scribal error (-kṣ- < -jy-) here.

Another aspect to consider is that the verb *rān* 染 also occurs with a meaning akin to that seen in (12a), i.e. 'to cling on', 'to be attached' (even 'to long for' in this case), without the use of the preposition *yú* to introduce the object of attachment, see for instance (13a) and (13b). Note also that both constructions make use of the passive *wéi* construction as well, along with the active use of *rān*; (13b) even presents the passive and active uses of *rān* one after the other.

(13)

a. 為樂受觸，不染欲樂。

wéi *lè* *shòu* *chù,* *bù* *rān* *yùlè*
COP pleasant feeling touch NEG be_attached pleasure

'[When he is] touched by a pleasant feeling, he does not become **attached to pleasure**'. (T 99, 120a27-8)*

* The passage is quoted from *sūtra* no. 470 of the Chinese *Samyuktāgama* (*Zhā āhán jīng* 雜阿含經) translated by Guṇabhadra (ch. *Qíunàbátuó* 求那跋陀) mid-fifth c. CE. The *sūtra* is very close in terms of content to the *Sallattenasutta* of the *Samyutta Nikāya*, but the Pāli version lacks a precise parallel of the passage quoted in (13a). The closest parallel passage (SN IV.36.6.10, 209.18-19) reads: *so dukkhāya vedanāya phuṭṭho samāno kāmasukhaṃ nābhinandati* (While being touched by a painful feeling, he does not long for sensual pleasure).

b. 復為欲所染, 染欲著欲。

fù wéi yù suǒ rǎn, rǎn yù zhuó yù
moreover COP desire NMLZ taint be_attached desire cling_on desire
Moreover, [they] are tainted by desire, [they] **are attached to desire**, [they] cling on
desire'. (T 26, 796a10-11)*

* The passage is quoted from *sūtra* no. 213 of the Chinese *Madhyamāgama* (*Zhōng āhán jīng* 中阿含經, T26) transl. by Gautama Samghadeva (ch. *Qùtán Sēngqiétípó* 瞿曇曇伽提婆) at the end of the fifth c. CE. The *sūtra* is close in terms of content to the *Dhammacetiya sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*, but the Pāli version lacks a precise parallel of the passage quoted in (13b). The closest parallel passage (MN II.4.9, 120.14-15) reads *pañcahi kāmagaṇehi samappitā samaṅgibhūtā parivārenti* (They amuse themselves supplied and provided with the five qualities of desire).

As shown by these examples, the functional distinction expressed by *yú* with the verb *rǎn* appears to be quite labile: the forms *rǎn* 染 / *rǎn yú* 染於 are synonymous, both taking a location/goal object which can be optionally introduced by the preposition *yú* (cf. Zeng 2020, 269-72). In light of this, one should note that 'metrical' reasons could also underlie the use of *yú* in this context: Chinese translations often show a strong preference for specific patterns in terms of the number of characters - notably a preference for a four or five-character pattern (Zürcher 1977, 178) - which results into a highly 'rhythimized' text. It is probable that the tetra-syllabic form *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 suited better certain prosodic contexts than the trisyllabic equivalent *bù rǎn yù* 不染欲. As also noted by Méi (2018, 347), one can conclude that in Middle Chinese *yú* 於 did not have a strong grammatical connotation, but, at least in these examples, mainly served as a prosodic filler.

This concise survey has illustrated how the passive interpretation of *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 in (9) appears to be very dubious, despite the comparative evidence provided by the parallels. In the following sections, it will be discussed how such an erratic translation could find a possible explanation by broadening the scope of the comparative material taken into consideration and looking to a larger set of Indic parallels.

4 A Broader Focus

By fortunate chance, there are only a few occurrences of the expression *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 in the Taishō Canon, so it is possible to look at their various Indic parallels quite in detail. Besides the instance found in T 223 quoted in (9), there are other seven occurrences found in the following six texts:

1. T 26, *Zhōng āhán jīng* 中阿含經;
2. T 212, *Chūyào jīng* 出曜經;
3. T 221, *Fàngguāng bānrě jīng* 放光般若經;
4. T 309, *Zuìshèng wèn púsà shízhù chūgòu duànjié jīng* 最勝問菩薩十住除垢斷結經;
5. T 814, *Fó shuō xiàngyè jīng* 佛說象腋經;
6. T 1509, *Dà zhìdù lùn* 大智度論.

For the present discussion, I will focus on the parallels from the first two *sūtras* (T 26 and T 212), as they provide the most interesting insights into the Chinese expression and its relationship with the Indic source forms. As it will be illustrated later, the instances of *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 in T 26 and T 212 have a number of parallels attested in a group of related texts which have come down to us in various Indic languages, transmitted under the name of *Dharmapada* (*Pāli Dhammapada*) and *Udānavarga* (Nattier 2023, 216-17 for an overview). These texts represent different sectarian modifications of a collection of verses inherited from the earliest Buddhist tradition (Brough 1962, 34-41; Lenz 2003, 11-14). In the following, I will refer collectively to this group of texts as the '*Dharmapada-Udānavarga* texts'. I will comment briefly on the remaining instances of *bù rǎn yú yù* before proceeding to the analysis of T 26 and T 212.

The *Dà zhìdù lùn* 大智度論 (T 1509) is a commentary on the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* translated by Kumārajīva (see Zacchetti 2021) and thus, not surprisingly, also contains the same expression of the root text translated by the same author. Besides the instance found in T 814 (783b14-15),¹³ the remaining two instances are connected to the seventh *bhūmi* of the *bodhisattva* path. In T 221 (translated by Moksāla) the expression belongs to a list of 40 *dharma*s (20+20) that a *bodhisattva* on the seventh *bhūmi* must avoid (first twenties) and do (remaining twenties) in order to pass to the next stage. More precisely, T 221 (27c11) reads *bù rǎn yú yù shì* 不染於欲事 (not attached to sensual matters) as the last *dharma* of the second group of twenty *dharma*s. As regards the other Chinese translations of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*, the expression corresponds to T 222 (196c20, Dharmarakṣa) *wú suǒ*

¹³ The Taishō Canon ascribes the translation to Dharmamitra (ch. *Tánmómìduō* 曇摩蜜多, d. 442 CE), but the attribution is dubious, cf. Silk 2010, 376 fn. 23.

rǎnwū 無所染污 (without tainting) (twentieth *dharma* of the first group), to T 223 (257b18, Kumārajīva) *bù rǎn ài* 不染愛 (not attached to desire) (twentieth *dharma* of the second group) and to T 220 (83b25, Xuánzàng) *yīng yuánmǎn wú suǒ àirǎn* 應圓滿無所愛染 (perfectly [and] completely without the taint of desire) (nineteenth *dharma* of the second group). Although all the Chinese parallels seem to agree in listing the very same element towards the end of the second group of dharmas (in T 222 it is however placed at the end of the first), no trace of a parallel element appears to exist in the parallel passage of Nepalese recension of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* (Pañca 216.8 ff.). Lamotte (1980, 2430) provides the Sanskrit reading *akliṣṭo 'nunayaḥ* (unafflicted affection) for the last *dharma* of the second group in the *sūtra* quotation of his translation of the *Dà zhìdù lùn*. This reading seems indeed to be a genuine parallel of the *dharma* in the Chinese translations, but I ignore whether Lamotte used a Sanskrit parallel from a different version of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*,¹⁴ or even from a different text (cf. Lamotte 1980, x), or he back-translated it into Sanskrit from the Chinese form. Even though the Indic source expression underlying the Chinese translations of this *dharma* is not entirely clear, it is interesting to see that the four translations show a certain degree of polarization between the two meanings 'to be tainted' and 'to be attached' already seen in the case of (9) and (10). Note also that in this case Kumārajīva employs the form *bù rǎn ài* 不染愛 (not attached to desire) without the use of the preposition *yú*. The last occurrence of *bù rǎn yú yù* appears in T 309 (978a18) authored by Zhú Fóniàn 竺佛念 (Nattier 2010; Lin, Radich 2021) in the same context of the enumeration of the dharmas to be performed in the seventh *bhūmi*.

The first occurrence of the expression among the two other *sūtras* is in a verse passage of *sūtra* no. 28 of the Chinese *Madhyamāgama* as given in (14a). Other Chinese parallels of the same verse passage are found in the two Chinese translations of the *Samyuktāgama*, namely

¹⁴ The label *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* denotes what Zacchetti (2005, 36; 2021, 23) called a 'textual family', with the sense of "a group of texts that share a number of common features in structure, content, wording, etc. They exhibit a family resemblance, so to speak, fluid and not always easy to define, but significant enough to set them apart from other texts [...] as a distinct group" (2005, 36). The prototype from which the texts belonging to this family stemmed was probably rather fluid in the earliest phase (third-fifth c.), ranging from 17,000 to 22,000 stanzas (Zacchetti 2015, 185). The version represented by the Gilgit *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* bears witnesses in terms of size to this stage of textual development, besides showing a close relationship with the recension of text commented in the *Dà zhìdù lùn* (Zacchetti 2021, 82 ff.); unfortunately, the Gilgit *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* remains largely unedited. In later times, the text saw a process of development and expansion, with the canonical subdivision in the three versions in 100,000 stanzas (*Śatasāhasrikā*), in 25,000 (*Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*) and in 18,000 stanzas (*Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā*) reflected in Xuánzàng's translations. As a very large number of Sanskrit fragment manuscripts of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* have survived (cf. Zacchetti 2005, 17-19 fnn. 53-4), I am not able here to look at all the possible parallels.

in *sūtra* no. 592 of *Zá āhán jīng* 雜阿含經 (T 99), see (14b), and *sūtra* no. 186 of *Biéyì zá āhán jīng* 別譯雜阿含經 (T 100, translated between the second half of fourth c. and the first half of the fifth c. CE by an unknown translator), see (14c). Parallels of the passage are also found in the two Chinese translations of the *Udānavarga*, namely *Chūyào jīng* 出曜經 (T 212, translated by Zhú Fóniàn 竺佛念 in the late fourth c. CE), see (14d), and *Fǎjí yàosòng jīng* 法集要頌經 (T 213, translated by Tiānxīzāi 天息災 in the late tenth c. CE), see (14e).

(14)

- a. 如梵志滅度，以不染於欲，捨離一切願，逮得至安隱。

rú fànzhì mièdù, yǐ bù rǎn yú yù
like brāhmaṇa extinguish CONJ NEG be_attached to desire
shělí yīqiè yuàn dàidé, zhì ānyǐn
be_free all aspiration reach arrive tranquillity

'Like a *brāhmaṇa** who is calmed, because not **attached to desire**, getting rid of all the aspirations, he attains tranquillity'. (T 26, 460b16-17)

- * *Fànzhì* 梵志 lit. 'Brahmā-mind'. See Karashima 2016 for this folk-etymology-based translation of *brāhmaṇa*.

- b. 婆羅門涅槃，是則常安樂，愛欲所不染，解脫永無餘。

pólúómén nièpán, shì zé cháng ānlè,
brāhmaṇa extinguish that CONJ always ease
àiyù suǒ bù rǎn, jiětuō yǒng wú yú
desire NMLZ NEG taint liberate ever NEG remainder

'A *brāhmaṇa* who is calmed is always at ease, not **tainted by desire**, completely liberated forever'. (T 99, 158a27-28)

- c. 一切事安樂，婆羅門涅槃，無為欲所污，解脫於諸有。

yīqiè shì ānlè, pólúómén nièpán,
all matter ease brāhmaṇa extinguish
wú wéi yù suǒ wū, jiětuō yú zhū yǒu
NEG COP desire NMLZ stain liberate at INDF exist

'At ease in every matter is a *brāhmaṇa* who is calmed; not **stained by desire**, he is freed in every matter'. (T 100, 441a7-8)

- d. 一切得善眠，梵志取滅度，不為欲所染，盡脫於諸處。

yīqiè dé shàn mián, fànzhì qǔ mièdù,
all be_able well sleep brāhmaṇa seize extinction
bù wéi yù suǒ rǎn, jìn tuō yú zhū chù
NEG COP desire NMLZ taint completely liberate at INDF aspect

'Able to sleep well in every circumstance is a *brāhmaṇa* who has seized extinction, not **tainted by desire** and completely liberated in every regard'. (T 212, 756c8-9=757a4-5)

- e. 一切得安隱, 梵志取滅度, 不為欲所染, 盡脫於諸處。
 yīqiè dé ānyǐn, fànzhì qǔ mièdù,
 all attain tranquillity brāhmaṇa size extinction
 bù wéi yù suǒ rǎn, jìn tuō yú zhū chù
 NEG COP desire NMLZ taint completely liberate at INDF aspect
 'Always attains tranquillity a *brāhmaṇa* who has seized extinction, not **tainted by desire** and completely liberated in every matter'. (T 213, 794c23-4)

Precise parallels of the passage exist both in Pāli, see the passage from the *Cullavagga* given in (15a), and in Buddhist Sanskrit, see example (15b) from the *Samghabhedavastu*, example (15c) from the Sanskrit *Udānavarga* and example (15d) from the *Udānavarga* from Subāṣī.

(15)

- a. *sabbadā* ve *sukhaṃ* *seti*,
 always truly at_ease rest:PRS.3SG
brāhmaṇo *parinibbuto*,
 brahman:NOM completely_calmed:NOM
yo na ***lippiati*** ***kāmesu***,
 REL:NOM NEG be_attached:PRS.3SG desire:LOC.PL
sītībhūto *nirūpadhi*
 dispassionate:NOM controlled:NOM
 'Always rests at ease a brahman who is completely calmed, one who is not **attached to sensual pleasures**, dispassionate and controlled'. (Culv 6.4.4 = MN II.5.8)*

* Pāli parallels are found also in SN I.10.8.15 and AN I.3.34, 138.3-4.

- b. *sarvathā* vai *sukhaṃ* *śete*,
 in_everyway truly at_ease rest:PRS.3SG
brāhmaṇaḥ *parinirvṛtaḥ*,
 brahman:NOM completely_calmed:NOM
yo na ***lipyate*** ***kāmebhir***,
 REL:NOM NEG smear:PRS.PASS.3SG desire:INS.PL
vīpramukto *nirāśravaḥ*
 liberated:NOM sinless:NOM
 'In every circumstance rests at ease a brahman who is completely calmed, one who is not **smeared by sensual pleasures**, liberated and without sins'. (Ud 30.28).

- c. *sarvathā* vai *sukhaṃ* *śete*,
 in_everyway truly at_ease rest:PRS.3SG
brāhmaṇaḥ *parinirvṛtaḥ*,

brahman:NOM completely_calmed:NOM
lipyate yo na **kāmair**,
smear:PRS.PASS.3SG REL:NOM NEG desire:INS.PL
hi vipramukto nirupadhiḥ
for liberated:NOM controlled:NOM

‘In every circumstance rests at ease a brahman who is completely calmed, one who is not **smeared by sensual pleasures**, liberated and controlled’. (Saṅghabh, 169.16-17)

- d. sarvvato vai sukhaṃ śeti,
in_everyway truly at_ease rest:PRS.3SG
brāhmaṇā parinirvṛtaḥ,
brahman:NOM completely_calmed:NOM
yo na **lipyati** **kāmehi**,
REL:NOM NEG smear:PRS.PASS.3SG desire:INS.PL
vipramuktan niropadhiḥ
liberated:NOM controlled:NOM

‘In every circumstance rests at ease a brahman who is completely calmed, one who is not **smeared by sensual pleasures**, liberated and controlled’. (UdS 423)

The second occurrence is found in *Chūyào jīng* 出曜經, quoted in (16a), one of the Chinese translations of the *Udānavarga*. A Chinese parallel is found in the other translation of the same text (i.e. *Fǎjī yàosòng jīng* 法集要頌經), see (16b). A Sanskrit parallel of the passage occurs in the Sanskrit *Udānavarga*, see (16c).

16.

- a. 如月清明, 懸處虛空, 不染於欲, 是謂梵志。

rú yuè qīngmíng, xuán chù xūkōng,
like moon bright hang place sky
bù rǎn yú yù, shì wèi fànzhì
NEG be_attached to desire that be_called brāhmaṇa

‘Like the moon, clear and bright, hanging in the sky, [one who] is not **attached to desire** is called a *brāhmaṇa*’. (T 212, 771c20-1=771c25)

- b. 如月清明朗, 懸處於虛空, 不染於愛欲, 是名為梵志。

rú yuè qīng mínglǎng, xuán chù yú xūkōng,
like moon bright clear hang place on sky
bù rǎn yú àiyù, shì míng wéi fànzhì
NEG be_attached to desire that name COP brāhmaṇa

‘Like the moon, clear and bright, hanging in the sky, [one who] is not **attached to desire** is called a *brāhmaṇa*’. (T 213, 798c4-5)

- c. *candro* *vā vimalaḥ* *śuddho*,
moon:NOM or bright:NOM pure:NOM
viprasanno *hy anāvilaḥ*,
unperturbed:NOM for clear:NOM
na lipyate *yo hi kāmair*,
NEG smear:PRS. REL:NOM for desire:INS.PL
PASS.3SG
bravāmi brāhmaṇam hi tam
call:PRS.1SG brahman:ACC for 3SG:ACC
'[Like] the moon is bright, pure, unperturbed and clear, whoever is not **smeared by sensual pleasures**, him I call a brahman'. (Ud 33.31A)

A last group of examples needs to be quoted: in this case, the Chinese parallels of the passage in T 212 and T 213 do not include the syntagm *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 (the *wéi* 為 construction is employed in its place), see (17a) and (17b).¹⁵ However, a precise parallel containing the variant *yú yù bù rǎn* 於欲不染 is included in a Chinese translation of a commentary on the *Vinaya*, namely *Shànjiànǚ pípóshā* 善見律毘婆沙 (T 1462), see (17c).¹⁶

17.

- a. 猶如眾華葉，以鍼貫芥子，不為欲所染，是謂名梵志。
yóurú zhòng huá yè, yǐ zhēn guàn jièzǐ,
like many lotus leaf CONJ awl pass_through mustard.seed
bù wéi yù suǒ rǎn, shì wèimíng fànzhì

¹⁵ Besides the two Chinese translations of the *Udānavarga* introduced above (i.e. T 212 and T 213), there are two extant Chinese compilations of the *Dharmapada*, namely the *Fǎjù jīng* 法句經 (T 210, translated by Zhū Jiāngyán 竺將炎 in 224 CE and subsequently revised by Zhī Qiān by supplementing it with material drawn from other sources, see Nattier 2023) and *Fǎjù pīyù jīng* 法句譬喻經 (T 211, translated by Fǎjù 法炬 and Fǎlì 法立 during 290-306 CE). These two translations do not contain precise parallels of the verses quoted in this paper (cf. Willemen 1974). Notwithstanding, one verse from chapter 35 of T 210 (572c19-20, corresponding to the *Brāhmaṇavagga*) appears to read a possible translation of *na lipyate kāmair* rendered by means of the *wéi* construction: *xīn qì èfǎ, rú shé tuōpí, bù wéi yù wǔ, shì wèi fànzhì* 心棄惡法，如蛇脫皮，不為欲污，是謂梵志 (One whose mind has abandoned evil dharmas, like a snake liberating himself from its skin, **not contaminated by desire**, that is called a *brāhmaṇa*). The simile of the snake liberating itself from its skin is generally found in numerous verses of the *Bhikṣuvarga* in various Indic parallels (e.g. Sanskrit *Udānavarga*, *Udānavarga* from Subāṣi, Khotan *Dharmapada*, London *Dharmapada*) or as a separate section (*Uruga*) in the Patna *Dharmapada* (PDhp 209 ff.), or even as a separate sutta in the Pāli *Suttanipāta* (*Uragasutta*, Snp 1-3). None of the verses found among those parallels, however, appear to correspond to the Chinese verse discussed here.

¹⁶ Translated by Saṃghabhadra (ch. Sēngqiébātuólúó 僧伽跋陀羅) in 488-9. *Shànjiànǚ pípóshā* 善見律毘婆沙 (**Sudarśanavinayavibhāṣā*), partially corresponds to the Pāli *Samantapāsādikā*, a commentary on the *Vinaya* attributed to Buddhaghosa (fifth c. CE), cf. von Hinüber 1996, 209; Heirman 2004.

NEG COP desire NMLZ smear that call brāhmaṇa
‘Like [water is not attached to] the leaves of the lotus, [like] with an awl going through mustard seeds [the latter do not adhere to the point of the former], [one who] is not **contaminated by desire** is called a *brāhmaṇa*’. (T 212, 771c3-4=771c9-10)

- b. 猶如眾華葉, 以針貫芥子, 不為欲所染, 是名為梵志。
yóurú zhòng huá yè, yǐ zhēn guàn jièzǐ,
like many lotus leaf with awl pass_through mustard.seed
bù wéi yù suǒ rǎn, shì míng wéi fànzhì
NEG COP desire NMLZ taint that call COP brāhmaṇa
‘Like [water is not attached to] the leaves of the lotus, [like] with an awl going through mustard seeds [the latter do not adhere to the point of the former], [one who] is not **tainted by desire** is called a *brāhmaṇa*’. (T 213, 798b29-c1)

- c. 如蓮華在水, 芥子投針鋒, 若於欲不染, 我名婆羅門。
rú liánhuá zài shuǐ, jièzǐ tóu zhēnfēng
like lotus.flower on water mustard.seed lodge awl.point
ruò yú yù bù rǎn, wǒ míng póluómén
REL to desire NEG be_attached I name brāhmaṇa
‘Like a lotus flower on water, or mustard seeds sticking to the point of an awl, one who is **not attached to desire**, him I call a *brāhmaṇa*’. (T 1462, 725a17-18)

For the purpose at hand, this passage is particularly relevant with regard to the Indic side of the discussion, since the majority of the *Dharmapada-Udānavarga* texts that have survived in Indic languages include a parallel of the passage. Parallels are found in Pāli, see (18a) from the Pāli *Dhammapada*, in the Hybrid Prakrit variety represented by the Patna *Dhammapada*,¹⁷ (18b), in Buddhist Sanskrit, as in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* of the Mahāsāṃghikas and in the Sanskrit

¹⁷ The Patna *Dhammapada* represents an interesting case among early Indic Buddhist texts, as it is written in a particular Prakrit variety more Sanskritized than Pāli but not as Sanskritized as the texts belonging to ‘Group 1’ and ‘Group 2’ in Edgerton’s (1953, xxv) classification of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit sources (Dimitrov 2020, 79 ff.; von Hinüber 1989, 362-6; Norman 1989; Roth 1980). The text can be attributed with a certain degree of certainty to the Saṃmitīya school (Skilling 1997). Considering that the *Dharmapada* is a canonical text, it is reasonable to postulate the existence of a Saṃmitīya canon written in the same canonical language of the Patna *Dhammapada* (Dimitrov 2020, 162) and some traces of other texts in such language have been indeed recently discovered (Dimitrov 2020, 162 ff.; Tournier 2023). Dimitrov (2020, 155 ff.) has proposed the name ‘Saindhavī’ for this Prakrit variety, also arguing that such label was used by the Saṃmitīya communities themselves, a claim that has not been however accepted by all scholars (cf. Tournier 2023, 440 fn. 116).

Udānavarga, (18c) and (18d), and in Gāndhārī, (18e) from the Khotan *Dharmapada*.¹⁸

18.

a.	<i>vāri</i>		<i>pukkarapatte</i>	<i>va,</i>
	water:NOM		lotus.leaf:LOC	or
	<i>ārage-r-iva</i>		<i>sāsapo,</i>	
	point_of_awl:LOC-like		mustard_seed:NOM	
	<i>yo</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>lippati</i>	<i>kāmesu,</i>
	REL:NOM	NEG	be_attached:PRS.3SG	desire:LOC.PL
	<i>tam</i>	<i>ahaṃ</i>	<i>brūmi</i>	<i>brāhmaṇaṃ</i>
	3SG:ACC	1SG:NOM	call:PRS.1SG	brahman:ACC

‘Whoever **does not cling to sensual pleasures**, just as water does nor cling to a lotus leaf, or a mustard seed to the point of an awl, him I call a brahman’. (Dhp 401, * transl. by Norman 1997b, 57)

* Pāli parallels are also found in Snp 625 = Sp I, 273.5

b.	<i>vārī</i>		<i>pokkarapatte</i>	<i>vā,</i>
	water:NOM		lotus.leaf:LOC	or
	<i>ārāgre-r-iva</i>		<i>sāsavo,</i>	
	point_of_awl:LOC-like		mustard_seed:NOM	
	<i>yo</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>lippati</i>	<i>kāmesu,</i>
	REL.NOM	NEG	be_attached:PRS.3SG	desire:LOC.PL
	<i>tam</i>	<i>ahaṃ</i>	<i>brūmi</i>	<i>brāhmaṇaṃ.</i>
	3SG:ACC	1SG:NOM	call:PRS.1SG	brahman:ACC

‘Like water [is not attached to] a lotus leaf, or a mustard seed to the point of an awl, one who is not **attached to sensual pleasures**, him I call a brahman’. (PDhp 38)

c.	<i>vāri</i>		<i>puṣkarapatre</i>	<i>vā,</i>
	water:NOM		lotus.leaf:LOC	or
	<i>ārāgre</i>		<i>iva</i>	<i>sarṣapaḥ,</i>
	point_of_awl:LOC		like	mustard_seed:NOM
	<i>yo</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>lipyati</i>	<i>kāmeṣu,</i>

¹⁸ The remaining attested Indic text-fragments of *Dharmapada-Udānavarga* texts, namely the aforementioned *Udānavarga* from Subaśi, the London *Dharmapada* (Lenz 2003) and the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* from the Split Collection (Falk 2015), do not contain parallels of the verse analysed in (18) - or at least the parallel verse has not survived. A final occurrence of the expression *na lipyate kāmāiḥ* is contained in verse 37 of the *Brāhmaṇavarga* from the Sanskrit *Udānavarga* (Ud 33.37): *ākāśam iva pañkena, rajasā candramā iva, na lipyate yo hi kāmair, bravīmi brāhmaṇaṃ hi tam* (Like sky by dirt, or moon by impurity, one who is not smeared by sensual pleasures, him I call a brahman). All the other Indic texts, as well as the translations in other languages, do not seem to have a parallel of this passage (cf. Willemen 1974, 49).

REL.NOM NEG be_attached:PRS3SG desires:LOC.PL
tan me śakra varaṃ dada
 3SG.ACC 1SG:GEN Śakra:VOC favour:ACC give:IMP.2SG

‘Like water [is not attached to] a lotus leaf, or a mustard seed to the point of an awl, one who is not **attached to sensual pleasures**, him, O Śakra, I ask you to favour’. (BhīVin 148.6)

d. *vāri puṣkarapatreṇvārāgreṇeva* sarśapaḥ,*
 water:NOM lotus.leaf:INS=like=point_of_awl:INS=like mustard_seed:NOM
na lipyate yo hi kāmair
 NEG smear:PRS.PASS.3SG REL:NOM indeed desire:INS.PL
bravīmi brāhmaṇaṃ hi tam
 call:PRS.1SG brahman:ACC indeed 3SG.ACC

‘Like water by a lotus leaf, or a mustard seed by the point of an awl, one who is not **smeared by sensual pleasures**, him I call a brahman’. (Ud 33.30)

* As aptly pointed out by one of the anonymous reviewers, the use of the instrumental singular here instead of the locative as in all the other parallels is awkward both syntactically and content-wise. It probably represents an emendation triggered by INS. PL. *kāmair* in the second hemistich.

e. *vari puṣkarapatre va arage-r-iva sarśava,*
 water:NOM lotus.leaf:LOC or point_of_awl:LOC-like mustard_seed:NOM
yo na lipadi kamehi,
 REL:NOM NEG smear:PRS.PASS.3SG desires:INS.PL
tam ahu bromi brahmaṇa.
 3SG.ACC 1SG:NOM call:PRS.1SG brahman:ACC

‘Like water [is not attached to] a lotus leaf, or a mustard seed to the point of an awl, one who is not **smeared by sensual pleasures**, him I call a brahman’. (Dhp G* 21)

In the light of the set of examples quoted above, two main points are to be highlighted. Firstly, as is the case with the passage from the Chinese translations of *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*, examples (9) and (10) above, in the various Chinese translations the syntagm *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 alternates with the passive *wéi* 為 construction in translating the same Indic source expression. In the case of T 212 and T 213, the two constructions even alternate in the very same text. Secondly, the various Indic parallels agree with each other almost verbatim, except for the case endings of the word stem *kāma-*. The two forms with the instrumental and locative are distributed quite distinctly among Sanskrit and Gāndhārī, on one side, and Pāli (and some Hybrid texts), on the other side [tab. 1]. Against this background, the oscillation in the Chinese translations between the passive construction and construction with the locative complement introduced by *yú* is worthy of attention, in that a similar semantic and

grammatical opposition of the verb complements is also observable in the Indic sources.

Table 1 Instrumental vs. locative marking

Instrumental		Locative	
Ud:	<i>lipyate kāmehhir/ kāmair</i>	Culv:	<i>lippati kāmesu</i>
Saṅghabh:	<i>lipyate kāmair</i>	Dhp:	<i>lippati kāmesu</i>
UdS:	<i>lipyati kāmehi</i>	PDhp:	<i>lippati kāmesu</i>
Dhp G ⁶ :	<i>lipadi kamehi</i>	BhīVin:	<i>lipyati kāmeṣu</i>

5 The Elusive Meaning of *lipyate/lippati*

The Indic parallels discussed above present two distinct patterns with the verb *lipyate/lippati* which, after Kulikov (2012, 208), we can summarize as follow:

- [i] 'to stick' S_{NOM} sticks to R_{LOC};
- [ii] 'to be smeared' R_{NOM} is smeared with/by S_{INS}.

In the first pattern, the subject of attachment is in the nominative and the locative encodes the recipient/object of attachment. In the second pattern, the nominative expresses the recipient/object of smearing and the instrumental expresses the instrument of smearing. The two patterns also bear a similar meaning, as being 'attached to sensual pleasures' can be seen as semantically contiguous to being 'tainted' by them. Nonetheless, the locative and instrumental formally encode semantic roles that are clearly different, a curious fact in light of the distribution of the two patterns in Buddhist sources. What is more, one finds it difficult to explain how a *-ya*-present could serve as a present passive with an instrumental agent and simultaneously be used intransitively with a locative complement without any apparent morphological modification. Given this peculiar opposition, we might want to look at the use of the verbal root *lip-* in Indo-Aryan in greater detail.

5.1 The Indo-Aryan Root *lip-*: Meaning and Case-Marking

Indo-Aryan *lip-* is derived from the PIE root **leip-*, whose basic meaning is 'to be sticky', 'to adhere' (Mayrhofer 1996, 460; Rix 2001, 408; Werba 1997, 228). Old Indo-Aryan continues the Indo-European root meaning by means of the two patterns introduced above (Kulikov 2012, 208-10). The earliest instance of pattern [i] is represented by (19a), quoted from the *Rgveda*, in which the *-ta* participle *riptám* (from the variant root form *rip-*) occurs with a locative complement expressing

the recipient of attachment/smearing. The same pattern is attested also with the present *lipyate* in the *Vājasaneyisaṃhitā* of the *Yajurveda* (repeated also in the *Īsopaniṣad*, cf. Thieme 1965, 90-1), see (19b). As noted by Kulikov (2012, 209), another instance of *lip-* occurs in the compound *vilipyāte* attested in the *Maitrāyāṇī Saṃhitā* (19c); here, the verb denotes the meaning of ‘to come unstuck’ and occurs with a subject of attachment/smearing, so it can be considered an instance of pattern [i].

(19)

- a. *yád vā svárau svádhitau riptám ásti*
REL:NOM or post:LOC axe:LOC smeared:NOM be:PRS.3SG
‘Or what is **smeared on the sacrificial post or on the axe**’. (RV 1.162.9, transl. by Jamison, Brereton 2014, 345)
- b. *eváṃ tváyi nányáthetó*
thus 2SG:LOC NEG=otherwise=hence
’sti ná kárma lipyate náre
exist:PRS.SG NEG action:NOM cling:PRS.3SG man:LOC
‘Thus, in this way and not otherwise, (the action) is in you, (and yet) the action **does not stick to the man** (that you are)’. (VS 40.2 = ĪSUp 2. Transl. by Kulikov 2012, 209)
- c. *skándati vā etád dhavír yád viścótati*
split:PRS.3SG or that:NOM offering:NOM rel:nom drop:PRS.3SG
yád vilipyāte
REL:NOM come_unstuck
‘That offering is spilt when it drops away or when it **comes unstuck**’. (MS III.9.7, 125.10-11=126.14-15=III.10.1, 130.4. Transl. by Kulikov 2012, 209)

The second pattern is attested from the *Brāhmaṇas* onwards, see (20a), quoted from the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*. The active counterpart with a nominative agent of smearing, an accusative recipient and instrumental of substance of smearing is also attested, see (20b).¹⁹

¹⁹ The *Rgveda* has also an instance of the perfect *riripúr* (5.85.8) used with the sense of ‘to cheat’. Such a meaning is argued to be derived from an admittedly not very compelling semantic extension of the meaning ‘to smear’ (Grassmann 1873, 1165; Kümmel 2000, 428). Alternatively, as claimed by Thieme (1995, 538 fn. 14), this usage represents a denominal verbal root (“radix postnominalis” in Thieme’s terms) homonym with the one continuing PIE **leip-*. The denominal root would have been abstracted from the adjective/noun *ripú-* (deceitful, enemy), in turn a dissimilated form from **rirpú-* < *rap-* (to chatter). The form *riripúr* aside, the only other instance of *lip-* attested in the *Rgveda* is the aorist middle *alipsata* occurring in 1.191.1, 3 and 4, where it follows the preverb *ní*. Thus, also in this case, *lip-* is used intransitively with a sense of ‘to be attached, to cling on’, which by means of the preverb *ní* attains the opposite meaning of ‘to disappear’ < ‘to become unstuck’, cf. Narten 1964, 26; Kulikov 2012, 210-11.

(20)

a. *na kármaṇā lipyate pápakena*
NEG action:INS smear:PRS.3SG evil:INS
'[He] is not smeared (i.e. tainted) by an evil action'. (ŚB 14.7.2.28)

b. *rudra oṣadhīr viṣeṇālimpat*
Rudra:NOM plant:ACC.PL poison:INS=smear:IPRF.3SG
'Rudra smeared the plants with poison'. (KS 6.5, 53.12)

In later Sanskrit sources, pattern [i] is significantly less common than pattern [ii] – Kulikov (2012, 210) even claims that it “seems to disappear” – being continued by other synonymous verbs such as *śliṣyate*, cf. (28) below. Pattern [i] is alive and well in Pāli and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, as shown above and further illustrated below, but it is certainly true that the typical form found in standard Sanskrit is pattern [ii], see example (21) quoted from the *Bhagavadgītā*.²⁰

(21) *lipyate na sa pāpena padmapatram ivāmbhasā*
smeared:PRS.PASS.3SG NEG 3SG:NOM sin:INS lotus.leaf:NOM like=water:INS
'He is not smeared (i.e. tainted) by sin like the leaf of the lotus [is untouched] by water'. (Bhag 5.10)

As rightly observed by Kulikov, pattern [i] certainly does not represent a passive, but rather denotes a non-passive intransitive ('anticausative', more precisely) expressing a spontaneous process, or better the state resulting from this spontaneous process ('becomes attached' > 'is attached'). The case is slightly more complicated with pattern [ii]: in § 2.1, we saw that, as a rule, present passives and class IV -ya-presents, are distinguished by the position of the accent, i.e. accented suffix in passives and accented root in class IV presents. The only accented instance of *lipyate* we possess is the one in (19c), which, despite the accented suffix, appears to represent a non-passive intransitive. Moreover, Kulikov notes that pattern [ii] should be more correctly described as the anticausative (rather than the passive) counterpart of active instances such as (20b), since the instrumental denotes the

²⁰ A quick search for *lipyate* in GRETIL (<https://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil.html>) shows that the ratio of instrumental to locative is overwhelmingly in favour of the former. One of the few occurrences of a possible instance of pattern [i] in Classical Sanskrit I was able to locate is the following passage from the *Mahābhārata* (13.1.37): *asaty api krte kārye neha pannaga lipyate* (O serpent, when an evil act is done, the doer is not implicated in that [lit. does not cling on it]). However, the verb *lipyate* could be here also understood as taking a coreferentially deleted instrumental referring to *asat*.

instrument and not the agent of smearing. Indeed, doublets such as (20a) and (20b) do not present any promotion of a hypothetical agent to the oblique case as one would expect from a prototypical passive; instead, the instrumental invariably marks the instrument of smearing in both cases, active and (pseudo-)passive. These pieces of evidence lead Kukikov (1998b, 347-8; 2012, 720) to conclude that OIA *lipyate* belongs to a group of OIA *-ya*-presents characterized by fluctuating accentuation between the root and the suffix, even though the form with root accentuation is by chance unattested.²¹

Pattern [i] and [ii] are both attested in Pāli, but in contrast with Sanskrit, it is pattern [i] which has the higher frequency. Some examples of pattern [i] have already been provided in § 4, see also (22a) below. Pattern [ii] is also relatively common, see for instance (22b), as well as its active counterpart in (22c).

(22)

- a. *so ubh'anta-m-abhiññāya majjhe mantā na lippati*
3SG:NOM both.end:ACC.PL-know:GER middle:LOC thinker:NOM NEG stick:PRS.3SG
'That thinker, knowing both ends, does not cling to the middle'. (Sn̄p 1042, transl. by Norman 2001, 132)
- b. *akāmakaraṇīyasmim̄ kuvidha pāpena lippati*
involuntary.act:LOC where sin:INS smear:PRS.PASS.3SG
'Where in an involuntary act is one smeared by sin?' (Jā V.528, 237.139)
- c. *padumaṃ yathā agginikāsiphālimaṃ*
lotus:ACC like fire.resembling.blossoming:NOM
na kadamo na rajo na vāri limp̄ati
NEG mud:NOM NEG dust:NOM NEG water:NOM smear:PRS.3SG
'Like mud, dust and water do not smear a lotus fully blossoming like fire'. (Jā III.397, 320.6)

Despite only a handful of examples occurring in the texts, Gāndhārī also presents both patterns. We have already seen pattern [ii] in (18e). Another instance of such sort can be found in section no. 19 of a Gāndhārī Commentary edited by Baums (2009); here the *-ta* participle *anoalito* (unsmeared; Sk. *anupaliptaḥ*) from the root *verse* quotation is explained by the commentator using the present *lipadi*.

²¹ As discussed by Kulikov (1997; 1998a; 1998b; 2012), the verbs belonging to this group also show semantic affinity, expressing what Kulikov labels as 'entropy increase', such as destruction and destructuring. The root form *lipyate* does not appear to be semantically related to this group, but the association could have happened via the compound forms *vilip-* and *nilip-* which denote processes akin to destructuring.

- (23) **jaleṇa** **pakeṇa** **aṇḥalito:** *jalo* *udago,*
 water:INS mud:INS unsmeared:NOM water:NOM water:NOM
pako *kadamo;* *yasa so* *tatra* *jado*
 mud:NOM mud:NOM like 3SG:NOM there born:NOM
vudhva *teṇa* *ca* *ṇa* *lipadi*
 grow:GER 3SG:INS and NEG smear:PRS.PASS.3SG
 'Unsmear**ed by water** (*jala* -) **and mud** (*paka* -): *jala* - is water, *paka* - is mud.
 As it, born and having grown there, still is not smeared by it'. (Nird, 445.183-4;
 transl. p. 306)*

* As in Baums' edition and translation, the text portions in bold represent the root verse quotations. The punctuation is mine and it is given to elucidate the syntax of the commentary; it does not reflect the original punctuation of the Gāndhārī manuscript provided in Baums' edition.

Moreover, the Khotan *Dharmapada* also presents an instance of pattern [i], see (24):

- (24) *yo* *du* ***puṇe*** *ca* ***pave*** *ca* ***duhayasa*** *na* ***lipadi***
 REL:NOM but virtue:LOC and sin:LOC and in_both NEG stick:PRS.3SG
 'One who does not **stick** neither **to virtue** nor **to sin**'. (Dhp G^K 183)

In § 4, it was shown how the two patterns are both attested in Buddhist Sanskrit, with pattern [i] occurring especially in slightly Sanskritized texts such as the Patna *Dharmapada* and the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*. I do not argue that the use of the locative instead of the instrumental is only related to the degree of Sanskritization of the *sūtras*; as a matter of fact, the Sanskrit *Udānavarga*, which shows a systematic use of the instrumental, is generally regarded as a Hybrid text proper too (von Hinüber 1989, 346-7). In light of this, there are probably also other causes of non-linguistic nature underlying this distribution which one has to consider, such as different lines of textual transmission reflecting different sectarian affiliations. Nonetheless, if the generalized use of pattern [ii] in place of pattern [i] is a feature of standard Sanskrit, it truly seems that in this regard the Sanskrit *Udānavarga* is more Sanskritized than the other *Dharmapada-Udānavarga* texts. In this respect, examples (22) from Pāli and (24) from Gāndhārī both present a similar use of pattern [i] and can indeed be considered parallel passages. Indic parallels also exist in the *Suttanipāta* and in the *Udānavarga*,²² see (25a) and (25b).

²² A close parallel occurs also in the *Mahāvastu*. The oldest palm-leaf manuscript (MS Sa) and paper manuscript (MS Na, cf. Marciniak 2016, 2017) both read *sarve puṇyo ca pāpā pi kā ubhayatra na lipyase*, which Marciniak (2019, 518) emends to *sarve puṇye ca pāpe pi ca ubhayatra na lipyase*. Marciniak (fn. 21) takes *sarve puṇye ca pāpe* as intr. pl. -e (< ai < aiḥ, cf. von Hinüber 2001 §316) with the sense of 'You are not stained

In this case too, the Sanskrit *Udānavarga* presents a distinctive use of pattern [ii], whereas the *Suttanipāta* shows the use of pattern [i].

(25)

a. *evaṃ puññe ca pāpe ca ubhaye tvaṃ na lippasi*
thus virtue:LOC and sin:LOC and both 2SG:NOM NEG stick:PRS.2SG
'So you do not **cling to merit** and **evil, both**'. (Snp 547, transl. by Norman 2001, 69)

b. *yas tu puñyais tathā pāpair ubhayena na lipyate*
REL:NOM but virtue:INS.PL so sin:INS.PL both:INS NEG smear:PRS.PASS.3SG
'One who is not **smeared** neither **by virtues** nor **sins**'. (Ud 33.28)

Another interesting instance of pattern [i] in Hybrid Sanskrit comes from the verses of the *Lalitavistara*, one of the *sūtras* placed by Edgerton (1953, xxv) in 'Group 2' of Buddhist Hybrid texts, see (26). In this case, the verb *lipyate* in the second *pada* parallels the class IV present *rajyate* (Pāli *rajjati*) found in the first *pada*, which possesses a similar meaning to *lipyate*, i.e. 'to be dyed, to be stained' and 'to be attached', as well as the use of the same two patterns with the same instrumental and locative. As it happens, however, in this instance *rajyate* occurs with pattern [ii], whereas *lipyate* with pattern [i], even though they are fundamentally used as synonyms.

(26) *na rajyate puruṣavarasya mānaṣaṃ*
NEG taint:PRS.PASS.3SG man.best:GEN mind:NOM
nabho yathā tamarajadhūmaketubhiḥ,
sky:NOM like darkness.dust.vapour.meteor:INS.PL
na lipyate viṣayasukheṣu nirmalo
NEG be_attached:PRS.3SG sense.pleasure:LOC.PL pure:NOM
jale yathā navanalināṃ samudbhūtaṃ
water:LOC like fresh.lotus:NOM rising_up:NOM
'The mind of the best among men **is not tainted**, like the sky [is not tainted] **by darkness, dust, vapour and meteors**; a pure one **is not attached to sensual pleasures**, like a fresh lotus rising up in the water/like a fresh lotus rising up [is untouched] by water'. (Lal 15.52, 92)

by merit or evil'. I am not entirely convinced by such emendation and its grammatical interpretation, but I cannot provide here a different proposal. Nonetheless, the difficult reading found in the *Mahāvastu* betrays the problems that scribes encountered in interpreting the syntax of *lipyate* already in ancient times.

To conclude this section, we also need to note that the active counterpart of pattern [ii] is attested in Buddhist Sanskrit as well, see for instance example (27) quoted from the *Ratnamālāvādāna*.

- (27) *pādayor ubhayos tena caṃdanena lilepa sā*
foot:ACC.DU both:ACC.DU 3SG:INS sandal:INS anoint:PRF.3SG 3SG:F.NOM
'She anointed [his] feet with that sandal oil'. (Ratna 22.32)

5.2 Diachronic Development: From Locative to Instrumental

The alternation between pattern [i] and pattern [iii] in MIA sources as illustrated above raises a number of questions, especially with regard to the examples discussed in Section 4, since the *Dharmapada-Udānavarga* texts ultimately represent different sectarian rearrangements of a common group of inherited verses. Thus, we can postulate that the two readings with the locative and instrumental complements are ultimately derived from a common 'urkanonish' formula which was transposed into the instrumental or locative forms during the process of transposition from the unidentified midland MIA dialect of the earliest predication into the various Buddhist Prakrits and subsequently into Buddhist Sanskrit. So, what was the pattern used in the original urkanonish source expression and how can we explain the alternation between the two patterns attested in the extant sources?

In MIA, the ending *-ehi* is used as a generalized oblique ending (von Hinüber 2001, § 321; Oberlies 2019, 36; Pischel 1900, § 371). As a consequence, the substitution of a historical instrumental for a locative, especially in the plural, is a common feature of Early MIA: instrumentals used as locatives are found already in the language of the *Upaniṣads* (Salomon 1991, 58) and are well-attested in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (Edgerton 1953, 44), Pāli (Lüders 1954, 220-5) and Gāndhārī (Lenz 2003, 56). On the other hand, in Prakrit locatives are also used as instrumentals (Oberlies 2019, 224); as put by Oberlies (2019, 225), we can talk of a certain "interchangeability on the part of the instrumental and locative plural" in MIA. The alternation between the instrumental and the locative observed in our sources, hence, is not surprising.

In this regard, Watanabe (2010) aptly observes that the simile of the lotus untouched by water and mud, as one is not touched by sensual pleasures, found in the *Dharmapada-Udānavarga* texts has parallels in Jain sources as well and can be traced back to a common archetype already present in the *Upaniṣads*. To substantiate this claim, Watanabe quotes a passage from the *Chāndogyopaniṣad*, quoted in (28), which is of particular interest for the present investigation. In this case, instead of *lipyate* found in Buddhist sources, one finds the

class IV present *śliṣyate* taking a locative complement as in pattern [i] of *lipyate*. The semantics of the two verbs is virtually the same and indeed the second part of this passage has the same meaning as found in the passage from the *Vājasaneyisaṃhitā* quoted in (19b).

- (28) *yathā puṣkarapalāśa āpo na śliṣyanta*
like lotus.leaf:LOC water:NOM.PL NEG stick:PRS.3PL
evam evaṃvidi pāpaṃ karma na śliṣyata iti
thus thus.knowing:LOC evil:NOM action:NOM NEG stick:PRS.3SG QUOT
'Like water does not **stick to the lotus leaf**, in the same way an evil action does not **stick to one who knows thus**'. (ChUp 4.14.3)

The example quoted above is revealing and can help us draw more solid conclusions as concerns the questions presented at the beginning of this section. First, if the verses occurring in the *Dharmapada-Udānavarga* texts echo the archetype attested in the *Upaniṣads*, it is legitimate to assume that the instrumentals occurring with *lipyate* were originally used as locatives. Second, as shown by the use of *śliṣyate* in the same exact context, the present *lipyate* with a locative complement as in pattern [i] represents a class IV present as *śliṣyate* (or *raḥyate*). The status of the verb was presumably still clear in Late OIA, but with the generalization of the oblique suffix *-ehi*, instances of pattern [i] with locative plurals were progressively reanalysed as cases of pattern [ii]. It is possible that this triggered the generalization of pattern [ii] also with singular complements (see 18d), which eventually led to the virtual disappearance of pattern [i] in Sanskrit and possibly also to the reanalysis of *lipyate* into an actual present passive. Pāli and Hybrid sources appears to have preserved (or possibly even restored) pattern [i], while the majority of Sanskrit sources continue the instrumental plural reading. Considering that in Classical Sanskrit *lipyate* is typically found with the instrumental, we can imagine that the 'passive' reading (i.e. pattern [ii]) ultimately became the standard and that later Buddhist Sanskrit texts reflect this process of standardization.

It is possible that not even the use of the locative was sufficient to solve the semantic and grammatical ambiguity of the source expression. As a matter of fact, Pāli texts often show a certain hesitation between the readings *lippiati* and *limpati* in pattern [i], see for instance the parallel of (15a) in SN I.10.8.15 proving that some of the monks who transmitted the scriptures were presumably also analysing *lippiati* as a present passive and hence not compatible with an

intransitive reading.²³ In this regard, Norman (1997a, 85 ff.) conjectures that this hesitation betrays the difficulty of the scribes to decide between an active and passive interpretation in the context of written transmission of the texts. Possibly due to the use of a writing system which did not distinguish geminated consonants (cf. Norman 1993, 240-1) and without the help of an oral tradition, metricaly ambiguous syllables were susceptible of a double interpretation, particularly in those cases where the context did not prove useful for the disambiguation.

6 How Was the Expression Understood by Translators?

One may wonder whether the Chinese and Tibetan translators were also aware of the semantic ambiguity of the expressions and that the instrumental *kāmehi/kāmaiḥ* occurring with *lipyate* could be understood as a locative. The Tibetan translation of the *Udānavarga* provides some insights into this issue. In (29) are given the respective translations of the verses quoted in (15), (16) and (18). In (29a) and (29b), the perfect *gos* (smeared) is preceded by the noun '*dod pa* (desire) marked with the ergative/instrumental suffix *-s*. On the other hand, (29c) presents a different verb, namely the present *gnas*, lit. 'to abide, to remain', preceded by the locative noun-phrase '*dod la* built with the locative postposition *la*. There is no evident reason to believe that the Sanskrit source text used for the Tibetan translation of the verse in (29c) read **na lipyate kāmeṣu* instead of the instrumental found elsewhere.²⁴ Therefore, one can conclude that the Tibetan translator was aware of the possible locative reading of the passage and that the context, especially the presence of the two

23 The confusion was also facilitated by the fact that the opposition of active and passive is generally based only on the stem due to the use of the active endings for the middle ones, see § 2.1.

24 As discussed by Schmithausen (1970, 59 ff.), the Sanskrit manuscripts from Central Asia used by Bernhard for his edition and the Tibetan translation represent two separate recensions of the *Udānavarga*. One can thus not completely exclude that the source text used for the Tibetan translation read a locative form of *kāma-*, although it seems quite unlikely. The only exception in following the locative reading among the Sanskrit sources used by Bernhard appears to be a Sanskrit fragment manuscript from the Ming Öy caves in Kizil (DUc in Bernhard's notation), which in the portions corresponding to 33.30, 33.31A and 33.28 respectively reads (*lipyate yo na kāme[ṣu]*, *lipyate y(a) [n](a) kāme(ṣu)* and *ca nobhāyatra* (471-3). As for the rest, the three Tibetan verses quoted here virtually agree almost verbatim with the Sanskrit recension of the *Udānavarga*. Besides the locative complement in (29c), the only other difference between the Tibetan and Sanskrit versions is the verb *jug* (he behaves) instead of Sanskrit *śete* (he rests).

locatives *puṣkarapatre* and *ārāgre* in the first half of the verse, were of help to disambiguate the meaning of the verb.²⁵

(29)

a. *bram ze mya ngan 'das pa dag, rnam pa kun tu bde bar 'jug,*
brāhmaṇa calmed and always at_ease act
gang zhig 'dod pa-s ma gos shing, zag med rab tu rnam grol ba
whoever desire-INS NEG smeared and immaculate completely_liberated
'A *brāhmaṇa* is calmed and in every circumstance behaves at ease, one who is **not smeared by desire**, immaculate and completely liberated'. (UdT 30.30)

b. *zla ba dag cing dri med la,*
moon pure and bright and
skyon bral rab tu dang ba ltar,
clear completely_clean like
gang zhig 'dod pa-s mi gos de,
whoever desire-INS NEG smeared that
bram ze yin par nga-s gsungs so
brāhmaṇa be I-ERG said fin
'Like the moon is pure, bright, clear and completely clean, one who is **not smeared by desire**, him I call a *brāhmaṇa*'. (UdT 33.38)

c. *padma 'i 'dab la chu ltar dang,*
lotus GEN leaf on water like and
smiyung bu 'i rtse la yungs kar ltar,
awl GEN point on mustard like
gang zhig 'dod la mi gnas de,
whoever desire in NEG abide that
bram ze yin par nga-s gsungs so
brāhmaṇa be I-ERG said fin
'Like water [does not cling on] a lotus leaf, or mustard to the point of an awl, one who **does not abide in desire**, him I call a *brāhmaṇa*'. (UdT 33.35)

The same issue also applies to the Chinese case: is it possible that the Chinese translators were aware of the semantic ambiguity behind the expression and of the possible locative reading of *kāmaiḥ/kāmehi*? The alternation between *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 and the *wéi* construction suggests that the locative interpretation of the passage was known by the Chinese translators as well. The Classical literary

²⁵ The Tibetan parallel of (25b, Ud 33.28), i.e. UdT 33.31, seems to follow the instrumental reading of the Sanskrit passage: *gang zhig dge dang sdig pa dang, gnyis ka yis kyang mi gos pa* (One who is not stained neither by virtues nor sin).

expression *rǎn yú* 染於 was probably a good solution to the eyes of the translators to render the ambiguous Indic expression, as both meaning of ‘to smear’ (‘to stain’ < ‘to dye’), and the oblique marking the locative complement (preposition *yú* 於) were simultaneously conveyed. As also seen in example (12), the relationship between the expression *rǎn yú* 染於 and a locative complement in the Indic source text, as well as an association with the meaning ‘to cling on, to stick to’, seems to be well-attested in the Chinese translated literature. Limiting the scope to Kumārajīva’s translation corpus, the passive *wéi* constructions is regularly employed by the Kuchean translator, see for instance the use of *wéi* in (6b); thus, it is extremely dubious that *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 could simply represent a ‘stylistic’ variation of the passive construction.

In this regard, it is interesting to see that in the commentary part of example (17a), Zhú Fóniàn mentions the act of ‘clinging’ (ch. *zhuó* 著) on the six external sensory objects, despite the fact that in the verse passage he employs the *wéi* construction.

- (30) 猶如蓮華之葉不受塵水,彼修行人亦復如是,以離於欲,不復著色聲香味細滑法。
yóurú liánhuā zhī yè bù shòu chén shuǐ,
 like lotus GEN leaf NEG receive dust water
bǐ xiūxíng rén yǐfù rúshì, yǐ lí yú yù,
 that practitioner also thus to depart from desire
bù fù zhuó sè shēng xiāng wèi xīhuá fǎ
 NEG also form sound smell taste touch* dharma
 ‘Like the leaves of the lotus are not touched by dust and water, that practitioner, in order to distance himself from desire, **does not cling to form, sound, smell, taste, touch and dharmas**’. (T 212, 771c5-6)

* Lit. ‘soft and smooth’, generally corresponding to Sk. *sparśa* ‘touch’ (Karashima 1998, 483; Vetter 2012, 177).

Moreover, Zhú Fóniàn employs the expression *rǎn yú yù* 染於欲 also to translate another verse from the *Paśyavarga* chapter of the *Udānavarga*. In this case, the verb in the Sanskrit parallel is not *lipyate*; the verb *rǎn* 染 seems rather to translate the Sanskrit *-ta* participle *mūḍha-* ‘confused’. What is relevant to the present discussion, however, is the presence of the locative plural complement *kāmeṣu*, as well as the fact that the ‘confusion’ mentioned in the verse derives from ‘clinging’ (Sk. *saktāḥ* ‘clinging’ = ch. *zhuó* 著) on desire.

- (31)
 a. 著欲染於欲,不究結使緣。
zhuó yù rǎn yú yù bù jiū jiéshǐ yuán
 cling desire be_attached to desire NEG understand fetter cause

'Clinging on desire, being attached to desire, [they] do not understand the cause of the fetter'. (T 212, 739a7)

- b. *kāmeṣu* *saktāḥ* *satataṃ* *hi* *mūḍhāḥ*,
desire:LOC.PL attached:NOM.PL constantly because confused:NOM.PL
saṃyojane *vadyam* *apaśyamānāḥ*
fetter:LOC sin:ACC not.see:PTCPL.PRS.PASS.NOM.PL
'Confused' because constantly **attached to sensual pleasures**, not seeing the sin in the fetter'. (Ud 27.27)

7 Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that the evidence from MIA corroborates Kulikov's (2012) hypothesis on the status of *lipyate*: it originally served as a class IV present intransitive with an anticausative meaning. Owing to the use of the historical instrumental plural as a generalized oblique plural ending in MIA, such intransitive usage as found in *lipyate kāmeḥi* < **lipyate kāmeṣu* eventually became ambiguous, as the original recipient/object of attachment could be taken as the instrument of smearing and the intransitive verb reanalysed as a present passive. The locative reading of *kāma-* was generally preserved in Pāli and in some Hybrid Sanskrit texts, whereas Gāndhārī possibly reflects the process of transition towards the generalized use of the instrumental. Later texts with a higher degree of Sanskritization, such as the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* discussed at the beginning of this paper, diverge from locative usage of Pāli and present instead the instrumental reading as well, presumably because in standard Sanskrit *lipyate* was generally used with the instrumental complement as the passive/anticausative counterpart of active *limpati*.

The Chinese and Tibetan translations reflect the semantic and grammatical ambiguity underlying the Indic source expression and even appear to show that the locative interpretation of the instrumental reading was known to the translators, in spite of the fact that that the Indic source texts used by them probably presented pattern [ii] with an instrumental plural.²⁶ The expression *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲, borrowed from literary Chinese, can be understood as an attempt to convey the locative meaning, as well as the semantic nuance

²⁶ One needs also to mention that it was a common practice for Chinese translators to rely on earlier popular or authoritative translations when producing a new one (Nattier 2008, 26). Thus, the use of *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 in place of the passive construction (and viceversa) could have also been influenced by reasons of stylistic choice of such sort.

of 'being stained', which derives from the literal sense of the expression 'to dye in'.

In closing, the Chinese translations of this expression also offer an insight into some methodological problems underlying the grammatical analysis of the Chinese Buddhist translations: the case of *bù rǎn yú yù* 不染於欲 shows how a precise grammatical interpretation of the linguistic material found in the Buddhist literature deeply relies on a thorough comparison of the Indic parallels.

Abbreviations

In the glosses

ACC	accusative
CONJ	conjunction
COP	copula
DU	dual
ERG	ergative
F	feminine
FIN	final particle
GEN	genitive
GER	gerund
GRND	gerundive
IMP	imperative
INDF	indefinite
INS	instrumental
IPRF	imperfect
LOC	locative
NEG	negation
NMLZ	nominalizer
NOM	nominative
PRF	perfect
PRS	present
PASS	passive
PL	plural
PTCPL	participle
QUOT	quotative particle
SG	singular
VOC	vocative
1	first person
2	second person
3	third person

In running text

A	agent
AN	<i>Aṅguttaranikāya</i> = Morris 1885-1900
Bhag	<i>Bhagavadgītā</i> = Belvalkar 1968
BhīVin	<i>Bhikṣuṇīvinaya</i> = Roth 1970
ChUp	<i>Chāndogyopaniṣad</i> = Olivelle 1998, 166-287
Ch	Chinese
Culv	<i>Cullavagga</i> = Oldenberg 1880
Dhp	Pāli <i>Dhammapada</i> = von Hinüber, Norman 1994
Dhp G ^k	Khotan <i>Dharmapada</i> = Brough 1962
ĪśUp	<i>Īśopaniṣad</i> = Olivelle 1998, 405-12
Jā	Pāli <i>Jātaka</i> = Fausbøll 1877-96
KS	<i>Kāṭhakaśaṃhitā</i> = von Schroeder 1900
Lal	<i>Lalitavistara</i> = Hokazono 2019
MIA	Middle Indo-Aryan
Mil	<i>Milindapañha</i> = Trenckner 1880
MN	<i>Majjhimanikāya</i> = Chalmers 1888-99
MS	<i>Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā</i> = von Schroeder 1885
Nird	Gāndhārī Commentary i.e. <i>Nirdeśa</i> = Baums 2009
OIA	Old Indo-Aryan
Pañca	<i>Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā</i> = Dutt 1934
PDhp	Patna <i>Dharmapada</i> = Cone 1989
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
R	recipient
Ratna	<i>Ratnamālāvadāna</i> = Takahata 1954
ṚV	<i>Ṛgveda</i> = van Nooten and Holland 1994
ŚB	<i>Śatapathabrāhmaṇa</i> = Weber 1855
S	subject
Saṅghabh	<i>Saṅghabhedavastu</i> = Gnoli 1978
SN	<i>Samyuttanikāya</i> = Feer 1884-98
Sk.	Sanskrit
Snp	<i>Suttanipāta</i> = Andersen, Smith 1913
Sp	<i>Samantapāsādikā</i> = Takakusu, Litt 1924
T	Taiśhō Canon = Takakusu, Watanabe 1924-32.
Ud	Sanskrit <i>Udānavarga</i> = Bernhard 1965
UdS	<i>Udānavarga</i> from Subaśi = Nakatani 1987
UdT	Tibetan <i>Udānavarga</i> = Dietz, Zongtse 1990
Vikn	<i>Vimalakīrtinirdeśa</i> = SGBSL 2006
V	verb
VS	<i>Vājasaneyisaṃhitā</i> = Weber 1852

Bibliography

- Abraham, W. (2006). "Introduction: Passivization and Typology. Form Vs. Function – A Confined Survey into the Research Status Quo". Abraham, Leisiö 2006, 1-28.
- Abraham, W.; Leisiö, L. (eds) (2006). *Passivization and Typology: Form and Function*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Aldridge, E. (2013a). "Survey of Chinese Historical Syntax Part I: Pre-Archaic and Archaic Chinese". *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 7(1), 39-57. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12006>.
- Aldridge, E. (2013b). "Survey of Chinese Historical Syntax Part II: Middle Chinese". *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 7(1), 58-77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12007>.
- Ān Jùnli 安俊丽 (2009). "Hàn Wèi Liù Cháo Hànyì fójīng 'jiàn' zì bèidòngjù yánjiū" 漢魏六朝漢譯佛經“見”字式被動句研究 (Research on “Jian” Passive Sentences in the Sutras from Han to South-North Dynasty). *Nèiměnggǔ dàxué xué bào* 內蒙古大學學報, 41(3), 133-6.
- Anderl, C. (2017). "Medieval Chinese Syntax". Sybesma, R. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Chinese Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill, 689-703.
- Barchi, F. (forthcoming). "Chinese Buddhist Translations as a Locus of Grammatical Interference". *Journal of Language Contact*, 16(4).
- Barchi, F.; Peschl, B. (2022). "Preterite Formations in Niya Prakrit and Khotanese: A Case of Grammatical Interference?". *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 75(3), 405-37. <https://doi.org/10.1556/062.2022.00223>.
- Baumgarten, N.; Özçetin, D. (2008). "Linguistic Variation Through Language Contact in Translation". Siemund, P.; Kintana, N. (eds), *Language Contact and Contact Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 293-316. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hsm.7.17bau>.
- Baums, S. (2009). *A Gāndhārī Commentary on Early Buddhist Verses: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 7, 9, 13 and 18*. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Becher, V.; House, J.; Kranich, S. (2009). "Convergence and Divergence of Communicative Norms Through Language Contact in Translation". Braumüller, K.; House, J. (eds), *Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 125-52. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hsm.8.06bec>.
- Brough, J. (1962). *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bubeník, V. (1996). *The Structure and Development of Middle Indo-Aryan Dialects*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Burrow, T. (1937). *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chao, Y.R. [1964] (2011). *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- Comrie, B. (1988). "Passive and Voice". Shibatani, M. (ed.), *Passive and Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 9-23. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.16.04com>.
- Dahl, E. (2016). "The Origin and Development of the Old Indo-Aryan Predicated -tá Construction". Dahl, E.; Stroński, K. (eds), *Indo-Aryan Ergativity in Typological and Diachronic Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 61-108. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.112.03dah>.

- Delbrück, B. (1888). *Altindische Syntax*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Demoto Mitsuyo 出本充代 (1995). "Senshū hyaku innen kyō no yakushutsu nendai ni tsuite" 撰集百因緣經の訳出年代について (On the Date of Translation of the *Zhuānjī bāi yuán jīng*). *Pārigaku Bukkyōgaku bunkagaku*, 8, 99-108.
- Dimitrov, D. (2020). *The Buddhist Indus Script and Scriptures: On the So-Called Bhaikṣukī or Saindhavī Script of the Sāṃmitīyas and their Canon*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Edgerton, F. (1953). *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. *Grammar*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Falk, H. (2015). "A New Gāndhārī Dharmapada (Texts from the Split Collection 3)". *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University*, 18, 23-62.
- Fortson, B.W. (2010). *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Geiger, W. (1916). *Pali: Literatur und Sprache*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner Verlag.
- Gotō, T. (2013). *Old Indo-Aryan Morphology and Its Indo-Iranian Background*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hashimoto, M.J. (1988). "The Structure and Typology of the Chinese Passive Construction". Shibatani, M. (ed.), *Passive and Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 329-54. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.16.11has>.
- Haspelmath, M. (1990). "The Grammaticization of Passive Morphology". *Studies in Language*, 14(1), 25-72. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.14.1.03has>.
- Heirman, A. (2004). "The Chinese 'Samantapāsādikā' and its School Affiliation". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 154(2), 371-96.
- von Hinüber, O. (1989). "Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit". Caillat, C. (éd.), *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*. Paris: Boccard, 341-67.
- von Hinüber, O. (1996). *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter.
- von Hinüber, O. (2001). *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. 2. erweiterte Auflage. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- von Hinüber, O. (2022). *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-Piṭaka: Durchgesehener und korrigierter Nachdruck im Neusatz, ergänzt um einen Sachindex von Petra Kieffer-Pülz*. Halle an der Saale: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittenberg.
- Hock, H.H. (1986). "'P-Oriented' Constructions in Sanskrit". Krishnamurti, B. (ed.), *South Asian Languages: Structure, Convergence and Diglossia*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 15-27.
- Hock, H.H. (2022). "Passives and Anticausatives in Vedic Sanskrit: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives". Dahl, E. (ed.), *Alignment and Alignment Change in the Indo-European Family*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 166-87. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198857907.003.0005>.
- Huáng Bǎoshēng 黃寶生 (2011). *Fàn Hàn duìkān Wéimójié suǒshuō jīng* 梵漢對勘維摩詰所說經 (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: A Sanskrit-Chinese Comparative Analysis). Beijing: Chinese Social Sciences Press.
- Jamison, S.W. (1984). "The Vedic Passive Optative and Its Functional Equivalents: A Study in the Syntax of the Gerundive". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 104(4), 609-20. <https://doi.org/10.2307/601895>.

- Jamison, S.W. (1990). "The Tense of the Predicated Past Participle in Vedic and Beyond". *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 33(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1163/000000090790083248>.
- Jamison, S.W. (2000). "Lurching towards Ergativity: Expressions of Agency in the Niya Documents". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 63(1), 64-80. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X00006455>.
- Karashima, S. (1998). *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the Lotus Sutra 正法華經詞典*. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Karashima, S. (2016). "Indian Folk Etymologies and Their Reflections in Chinese Translations – *bṛāhmaṇa*, *śramaṇa* and *Vaiśramaṇa*". *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University*, 19, 101-23
- Kazenin, K.I. (2001). "The Passive Voice". Haspelmath, M. et al. (eds), *Language Typology and Language Universals*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 899-916. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110194265-004>.
- Kranich, S. (2009). "Epistemic Modality in English Popular Scientific Texts and Their German Translations". *trans-kom*, 2(1), 26-41.
- Kranich, S. (2014). "Translations as a Locus of Language Contact". House, J. (ed.), *Translation: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 96-115. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137025487_6.
- Kranich, S.; Becher, V.; Höder, S. (2011). "A Tentative Typology of Translation-Induced Language Change". Kranich, S. et al. (eds), *Multilingual Discourse Production: Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 9-44. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hsm.12.02kra>.
- Kulikov, L. (1997). "Vedic *mriyāte* and Other Pseudo-Passives: Notes on an Accent Shift". Hegedűs, I. et al. (eds), *Indo-European, Nostratic, and Beyond: Festschrift for V.V. Shevoroshkin*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, 198-205.
- Kulikov, L. (1998a). "Passive, Anticausative and Classification of Verbs: The Case of Vedic". Kulikov, L.; Vater, H. (eds), *Typology of Verbal Categories: Papers Presented to Vladimir Nedjalkov on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 139-68. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110913750.139>.
- Kulikov, L. (1998b). "Vedic -ya-Presents: Semantics and the Place of Stress". Meid, W. (ed.), *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 341-50.
- Kulikov, L. (2006). "Passive and Middle in Indo-European: Reconstructing the Early Vedic Passive Paradigm". Abraham, Leisiö 2006, 62-82. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.68.06kul>.
- Kulikov, L. (2011). "Voice Typology". Song, J.J. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 368-98.
- Kulikov, L. (2012). *The Vedic -ya-Presents: Passives and Intransitivity in Old Indo-Aryan*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Kümmel, M.J. (1996). *Stativ und Passivaorist im Indoiranischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Kümmel, M.J. (2000). *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen: Eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den indoiranischen Sprachen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- Lamotte, É. (1980). *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna*. Tome 5, *Chapîtres XLIX-LII, et Chapitre XX*. Louvain: Muséon.
- Lenz, T. (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 State.
- Li, C.N.; Thompson, S.A. (1981). *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lín, Q.; Radich, M. (2021). "Computer-Assisted Analysis of Zhu Fonian's Original Mahāyāna Sutras". *Buddhist Studies Review*, 38(2), 145-68. <https://doi.org/10.1558/bsrv.21194>.
- Liú Shìzhèn 柳士鎮 (1992). *Wèi Jìn Nánběi Cháo lìshǐ yǔfǎ* 魏晉南北朝歷史語法 (Historical Grammar of Wei, Jin, North and South Dynasties Chinese). Nanjing: Nanjing University Press.
- Lüders, H. (1954). *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkans*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Luraghi, S.; Inglese, G.; Kölligan, D. (2021). "The Passive Voice in Ancient Indo-European Languages: Inflection, Derivation, Periphrastic Verb Forms". *Folia Linguistica*, 42(2), 339-91. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin-2021-2033>.
- Macdonell, A.A. (1916). *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Marciniak, K. (2016). "The Oldest Palm-Leaf Manuscript of the *Mahāvastu* (MS Sa). A Paleographic Description". *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University*, 19, 125-48.
- Marciniak, K. (2017). "The Oldest Paper Manuscript of the *Mahāvastu*". *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University*, 20, 103-21.
- Marciniak, K. (2019). *The Mahāvastu: A New Edition*, vol. 3. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Masica, C.P. (1993). *Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Méi Guǎng 梅廣 (2018). *Shàngǔ Hànyǔ yǔfǎ gāngyào* 上古漢語語法綱要 (An Outline of Classical Chinese Grammar). Shanghai: Shanghai Education Press.
- Narten, J. (1964). *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Nattier, J. (2008). *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Nattier, J. (2010). "Re-Evaluating Zhu Fonian's *Shizhu duanjie jing* (T309): Translation or Forgery?". *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University*, 13, 231-58.
- Nattier, J. (2023). "On Two Previously Unidentified Verses in Zhi Qian's Hybrid *Dharmapada*". *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University*, 26, 215-52.
- Norman, K.R. (1989). "Notes on the Patna *Dharmapada*". Samtani, N.H.; Prasad, H.S. (eds), *Amalā Prajñā: Aspects of Buddhist Studies: Professor P.V. Bapat Felicitation Volume*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 431-44.
- Norman, K.R. (1993). "The Development of Writing in India and its Effect upon the Pāli Canon". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens, Supplementband*, 36, 239-49.
- Norman, K.R. (1997a). *A Philological Approach to Buddhism: The Bukkyo Den-do Kyokai Lectures 1994*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

- Oberlies, T. (2019). *Pāli Grammar*. Bristol: The Pali Text Society.
- Pān Yūnzōng 潘允中 (1982). *Hànyǔ yǔfǎ shǐ gāiyào 漢語語法史概要* (Essentials of Chinese Historical Grammar). Zhengzhou: Zhōngzhōu shūhuà shè.
- Peyraube, A. (1989). "History of the Passive Constructions in Chinese Until the 10th Century". *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 17(2), 335-72.
- Peyraube, A.; Wiebusch, T. (1994). "Problems Relating to the History of Different Copulas in Ancient Chinese". Chen, M.Y.; Tzeng, O.J.L (eds), *In Honor of S-Y. Wang: Interdisciplinary Studies on Language and Language Change*. Taipei: Pyramid Press, 383-404.
- Pischel, R. (1900). *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Pulleyblank, E.G. (1986). "The Locative Particles *Yū* 于, *Yū* 於, and *Hu* 乎". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 106(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.2307/602358>.
- Pulleyblank, E.G. (1995). *Outline of Classical Chinese Grammar*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Roth, G. (1980). "Notes on the Patna *Dharmapada*. Supplement to Particular Features of the Language of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika Lokottaravādins". Bechert, H. (ed.), *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 93-7.
- Salomon, R. (1991). "A Linguistic Analysis of the Praśna Upaniṣad". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 35, 47-74.
- Schmithausen, L. (1970). "Zu den Rezensionen des Udānavargaḥ". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 14, 47-124.
- Shibatani, M. (1985). "Passives and Related Constructions: A Prototype Analysis". *Language*, 61(4), 821-48. <https://doi.org/10.2307/414491>.
- Shibatani, M. (2004). "Voice". Booij, G. et al. (eds), *Morphologie*. New York: De Gruyter, 1145-65. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110172782.2.14.1145>.
- Silk, J. (2010). "The *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing*: Translation, Non-Translation, Both or Neither?". *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 31(1-2), 369-420.
- Skilling, P. (1997). "On the School-Affiliation of the 'Patna *Dhammapada*'". *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 23, 83-122.
- Szemerényi, O. (1996). *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Teich, E. (2003). *Cross-Linguistic Variation in System and Text: A Methodology for the Investigation of Translations and Comparable Texts*. Hawthorne: De Gruyter.
- Thieme, P. (1965). "Īśopaniṣad (= Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā 40) 1-14". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 85(1), 89-99. <https://doi.org/10.2307/597710>.
- Thieme, P. (1995). "Radices postnominales". Söhnen-Thieme, R. (Hrsg.), *Kleine Schriften*, Bd. II. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1046-53.
- Tournier, V. (2023). "A 4th/5th-Century sūtra of the Saṃmitiya Canon? On the So-Called 'Continental Pāli' Inscription from Devnimori (Gujarat)". Cicuzza, C. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Third International Pali Studies Week — Paris 2018*. Bangkok; Lumbini: Fragile Palm Leaves Foundation; Lumbini International Research Institute, 403-70.
- Vetter, T. (2012). *A Lexicographical Study of An Shigao's and His Circle's Chinese Translations of Buddhist Texts*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies.

- Wáng Lì 王力 [1958] (2014). *Hànyǔ yǔfǎ shǐgǎo* 漢語語法史稿 (Historical Outline of Chinese Grammar). Beijing: Zhōnghuá shūjú.
- Watanabe Kenji 渡辺研二 (2010). "Hasuba to suiteki: Genson byakueha ko seiten to bukkyō seiten no gen denshō" 蓮葉と水滴—現存白衣派古聖典と仏教聖典の原伝承— (Lotus Leaf and Water Drop: The Two Different Versions in the Extant Jaina Agamas). *Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyū*, 58(2), 905-898. https://doi.org/10.4259/ibk.58.2_905.
- Wèi Péiquán 魏培泉 (1994). "Gǔ Hànyǔ bèidòngshì de fāzhǎn yǔ yǎnbiàn jīzhì" 古漢語被動式的發展與演變機制 (The Development of Passive Constructions in Ancient Chinese). Lǐ Rénguī; Huáng Jūrén; Tāng Zhìzhēn (eds), *Zhōngguó jìngnèi yǔyán jì yǔyánxué* 中國境內語言暨語言學. Taipei: Zhōngyāng yánjiūyuàn lǐshǐ yǔyán yánjiūsùǒ, 293-319.
- Willems, C. (1974). *Dharmapada: A Concordance to Udānavarga, Dhammapada, and the Chinese Dharmapada Literature*. Bruxelles: Institut belge des hautes études bouddhiques.
- Xu, D. (2006). *Typological Change in Chinese Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199297566.001.0001>.
- Yáng Bójùn 楊伯峻; Hé Lèshì 何樂士 (2001). *Gǔ Hànyǔ yǔfǎ jí qí fāzhǎn* 古漢語語法及其發展 (Ancient Chinese Grammar and Its Development). Beijing: Language Press.
- Zacchetti, S. (2005). *In Praise of the Light: A Critical Synoptic Edition with an Annotated Translation of Chapters 1-3 of Dharmarakṣa's 'Guang zan jing'* 光讚經, *Being the Earliest Chinese Translation of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā*. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Zacchetti, S. (2007). "Inventing a New Idiom: Some Aspects of the Language of the *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經 T 603 Translated by An Shigao". *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University*, 10, 395-416.
- Zacchetti, S. (2015). "Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras". Silk, J. (ed.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Vol. 1, *Literature and Languages*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 171-209
- Zacchetti, S. (2021). *The Da zhidu lun 大智度論 (*Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa) and the History of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā*. Bochum: Projektverlag.
- Zeng, J. (2020). *A Reevaluation of So-Called Passive Constructions in Ancient Chinese: From Pre-Qin to the Han Dynasty*. Gent: Universiteit Gent.
- Zeng, J.; Anderl, C. (2019). "The Formation of the Copula Function of Wei 为 and the Nature of the 'Wei 为 V' Construction". *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 47(1), 82-124.
- Zürcher, E. (1977). "Late Han Vernacular Elements in the Earliest Buddhist Translations". *Journal of Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 12, 177-203.

Text Editions

- Andersen, D.; Smith, H. (1913). *Sutta-nipāta*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Belvalkar, S.K. (1968). *The Bhagavadgītā: Being Reprint of Relevant Parts of Bhīṣmaparvan from B.O.R.Institute's Edition of the Mahābhārata*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Bernhard, F. (1965). *Udānavarga: Einleitung, Beschreibung der Handschriften, Textausgabe, Bibliographie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

- Chalmers, R. (1888-99). *The Majjhima-Nikāya*. 3 vols. London: The Pali Text Society.
- Cone, M. (1989). "Patna Dharmapada, Part I: Text". *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 13, 101-217.
- Dietz, S.; Zongtse, C.T. (1990). *Udānavarga: Der tibetische Text*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck; Ruprecht.
- Dutt, N. (1934). *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. London: Luzac.
- Fausbøll, V. (1877-96). *The Jataka together with its Commentary Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha*. 6 vols. London: Trübner.
- Feer, L. (1884-98). *The Samyutta-Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka*. 5 vols. London: The Pali Text Society.
- Gnoli, R. (1978). *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu: Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- von Hinüber, O.; Norman, K.R. (1994). *Dhammapada*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Hokazono Kōichi 外園幸一 (2019). *Raritavisutara no kenkyū (chūkan) ラリタヴィスタラの研究(中巻)* (Study on the Lalitavistara, vol. II). Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.
- Morris, R. (1885-1900). *The Aṅguttara Nikāya*. 5 vols. London: The Pali Text Society.
- Nakatani, H. (1987). *Udānavarga de Subaṣi: Éditions critique du manuscrit sanskrit sur bois provenant de Subaṣi; Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Fonds Pelliot / 1 : Texte et fac-similés*. Paris: Boccard.
- van Nooten, B.A.; Holland, G.B. (1994). *Rig Veda: A Metrically Restored Text with an Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Oldenberg, H. (1880). *The Vinaya Piṭakam: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*. Vol. 2, *The Cullavagga*. London: Williams; Norgate.
- Olivelle, P. (1998). *The Early Upaniṣads: Annotated Text and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roth, G. (1970). *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya: Including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- von Schroeder, L. (1885). *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā: Die Saṃhitā der Maitrāyaṇīya-Sākhā*, Bd 3. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- von Schroeder, L. (1900). *Kāṭhakam: Die Saṃhitā der Kaṭha-çākhā*, Bd. 1. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature (SGBSL) (2004). *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations 梵藏漢对照「維摩經」*. Tokyo: Taisho University Press.
- Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature (SGBSL) (2006). *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: A Sanskrit Edition Based upon the Manuscript Newly Found at the Potala Palace 梵文維摩經—ポタラ宮所蔵写本に基づく校訂*. Tokyo: Taisho University Press.
- Sturgeon, D. (2011). *Zhongguo zhezueshu dianzi jihua 中國哲學書電子化計劃* (Chinese Text Project). <http://ctext.org>.
- Sukthankar, V.S.; Belvalkar, S.K.; Vaidya, P.L. (1963). *The Mahābhārata: The Anuśāsanaparvan*. Part 1, *Being the 13. Book*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Takahata, K. (1954). *Ratnamālāvadāna*. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko.

- Takakusu, J.; Litt, D. (1924). *Samantapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Pitaka*, vol. 1. London; Boston: The Pali Text Society.
- Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎; Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭 (1924-32). *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經 (Taishō Tripiṭaka). Tokyo: Taishō shinshū daizōkyō kankōkai; Daizō shuppan.
- Trenckner, V. (1880). *The Milindapañho: Being Dialogues between King Milinda and the Buddhist sage Nāgasena*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Weber, A. (1852). *The Vājasaneyi-Sanhitā in the Mādhyandina- and the Kāṇva-Çâkhâ with the Commentary of Mahîdhara*. Berlin; London: Williams and Norgate.
- Weber, A. (1855). *The White Yajurveda. Vol. 2, The Çatapatha-Brâhmaṇa in the Mâhyandina-Çâkhâ*. Berlin: Dümmler.

Etymological Dictionaries

- Grassmann, H.G. (1873). *Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Mayrhofer, M. (1996). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, Bd. 2. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Rix, H. (2001). *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Werba, C.H. (1997). *Verba Indoarica. 1: Radices primariae*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Translations into Modern Languages

- Gómez, L.; Harrison, P. [with members of the Mangalam Translation Group] (2022). *The Teaching of Vimalakîrti: An English Translation of the Sanskrit Text Found in the Potala Palace, Lhasa*. Berkeley: Mangalam Press.
- Jamison, S.W.; Brereton, J.P. (2014). *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Norman, K.R. (1997b). *The Word of the Doctrine (Dhammapada)*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Norman, K.R. (2001). *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-nipāta)*. 2nd ed. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Thurman, R.A.F. (1976). *The Holy Teaching of Vimalakîrti: A Mahāyāna Scripture*. State College: Pennsylvania State University Press.