

Encyclopedia of Chinese Language and Linguistics

Volume 2

De–Med

GENERAL EDITOR

**Rint Sybesma**

*(Leiden University)*

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

**Wolfgang Behr**

*(University of Zurich)*

**Yueguo Gu**

*(Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)*

**Zev Handel**

*(University of Washington)*

**C.-T. James Huang**

*(Harvard University)*

**James Myers**

*(National Chung Cheng University)*

# ENCYCLOPEDIA OF CHINESE LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

## Volume 2 De–Med

*General Editor*

Rint Sybesma

*Associate Editors*

Wolfgang Behr

Yueguo Gu

Zev Handel

C.-T. James Huang

James Myers



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2017

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: [brill.com/brill-typeface](http://brill.com/brill-typeface).

ISBN 978-90-04-18643-9 (hardback, set)  
ISBN 978-90-04-26227-0 (hardback, vol. 1)  
ISBN 978-90-04-26223-2 (hardback, vol. 2)  
ISBN 978-90-04-26224-9 (hardback, vol. 3)  
ISBN 978-90-04-26225-6 (hardback, vol. 4)  
ISBN 978-90-04-26226-3 (hardback, vol. 5)

Copyright 2017 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.  
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Global Oriental and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

- 相伯吗?” [Is Mǎ Xiàngbó the real author of *Mǎshì wéntōng*?], *Xuélín mǎnlù* 学林漫录 5, 1982, 186–189.
- Yáng Shùdá 杨树达, *Mǎshì wéntōng kānwù* 馬氏文通刊誤 [Correction of mistakes in *Mǎshì wéntōng*], Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá 中華書局, 1962.
- Yáo Xiǎopíng 姚小平, “*Mǎshì wéntōng láiyuán kǎo* 馬氏文通来源考” [Examination of the sources of *Mǎshì wéntōng*], in: Yáo Xiǎopíng 姚小平, ed., *Mǎshì wéntōng yǔ Zhōngguó yǔyánxué shǐ* 馬氏文通与中国语言学史 [*Mǎshì wéntōng* and the history of Chinese linguistics], Běijīng 北京: Wàiyǔ jiàoxué yǔ yánjiū 外语教学与研究出版社, 2003, 112–137.
- Yáo Xiǎopíng 姚小平, ed., *Mǎshì wéntōng yǔ Zhōngguó yǔyánxué shǐ* 馬氏文通与中国语言学史 [*Mǎshì wéntōng* and the history of Chinese linguistics], Běijīng 北京: Wàiyǔ jiàoxué yǔ yánjiū 外语教学与研究出版社, 2003.
- Zádrapa, Lukáš, “Autorské předmluvy k *Mǎshì wéntōngu*—komentovaný překlad” [Prefaces to *Mǎshì wéntōng*—annotated Czech translation], *Studia Orientalia Slovaca* 7, 2008, 79–95.
- Zádrapa, Lukáš, *Word-class Flexibility in Classical Chinese: Adverbial and Verbal Uses of Nouns*, Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Zhāng Héyǒu 张和友, “Cóng *Mǎshì wéntōng* guānyú cì jí xiāngguān wèntí de lùnshù kàn Mǎ Jiànzhōng de ‘céngcǐ jiégòu’ sixiǎng 从马氏文通关于词及相关问题的论述看马建忠的‘层次结构’思想” [Looking at Mǎ Jiànzhōng’s idea of ‘hierarchical structure’ from the perspective of the discourse on cì and related problems in *Mǎshì wéntōng*], in: Yáo Xiǎopíng 姚小平, ed., *Mǎshì wéntōng yǔ Zhōngguó yǔyánxué shǐ* 馬氏文通与中国语言学史 [*Mǎshì wéntōng* and the history of Chinese linguistics], Běijīng 北京: Wàiyǔ jiàoxué yǔ yánjiū 外语教学与研究出版社, 2003, 190–208.
- Zhāng Wànqǐ 张万起, *Mǎshì wéntōng yánjiū zīliào* 馬氏文通研究资料 [Materials for research on *Mǎshì wéntōng*], Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá 中華書局, 1987.
- Zhāng Xīchēn 章锡琛, *Mǎshì wéntōng jiàozhù* 馬氏文通校注 [*Mǎshì wéntōng* collated and annotated], Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá 中華書局, 1956.
- Zhū Xīng 朱星, “*Mǎshì wéntōng* de zuòzhě jiūjìng shì shéi? 馬氏文通的作者究竟是谁?” [Who, in the end, is the author of *Mǎshì wéntōng*?], *Shèhuì kēxué zhànxiàn* 社会科学战线 3, 1980, 80.

Lukáš Zádrapa

## Medieval Chinese Syntax

### 1. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND PERIODIZATION

A definition of the periodization of Early Medieval Chinese (EMC) in terms of syntactic

development can only be provided tentatively. By convention, the beginning of Early Medieval Chinese is usually associated with the introduction of Buddhism to China, and the beginning of translation activities from Indic languages from circa the 2nd century CE onwards. This dating is based on the observation that many new grammatical markers and syntactic constructions for the first time *surfaced* (although some may well have existed earlier in the spoken language) in translated Buddhist texts, and that translation activities eventually had a considerable impact on language development.

However, some important changes can already be traced back to texts of the early Hàn Dynasty (e.g., the *Shǐjì* 史記; c. 109 BCE), and even before (although the first glimpse of these developments are practically exclusively seen in excavated texts from Northwestern Chinese; see for example Wèi 2000 and Jí 2004). The Eastern Hàn Dynasty (25–220 CE) can be regarded as a period of transition during which some of the features of Early Medieval Chinese are seen gradually emerging in written texts. A controversial case that has been widely studied in secondary literature is the development of *shì* 是 into a full copula during this period. Manuscript texts seem to feature an early usage of *shì* as a copula to a larger extent; however, also the usage in edited classical literature is disputed (see for example Guō 1990/1997, arguing for early usages in the *Mèngzǐ* 孟子, *Hánfēizǐ* 韓非子, etc.). Yáng (2009) argues against an early usage of *shì* as copula, and, analyzing manuscript literature, assumes that *shì* grammaticalized from the construction *shì wèi* 是謂 ‘this means’ (> ‘this is’ > COP ‘be’), current during the later Warring States and Qín periods. Although the origins of copula *shì* might have been considerably earlier, the regular use of this function can be traced to early Buddhist translation literature. However, systematic research on relatively recent archaeological findings (such as the manuscripts found at Lìyè 里耶, dating from the late 3rd cent. BCE.) will hopefully shed new light on the development of the copula. As such, the very early/transition phase of Early Medieval Chinese should be dated to circa 2nd/1st century BCE, coinciding with major changes concerning the phonology

and morphology in the transition from earlier stages of Chinese to Medieval Chinese, and the Early Medieval Chinese period “proper” starting with the emergence of Chinese Buddhist texts. However, the question of periodization is (and probably will remain) a major headache for historical linguists.

The differentiation between Early Medieval Chinese and Late Medieval Chinese (LMC) is somewhat artificial, but expedient for the study of the varieties of Medieval Chinese. Traditionally, the differentiation between Early Medieval Chinese and Late Medieval Chinese was based on phonological considerations (in these studies the acronyms EMC and LMC usually stand for “Early Middle Chinese” and “Late Middle Chinese”, respectively). However, this does not necessarily coincide with major syntactic changes. Because of the rather abrupt emergence of (nearly exclusively Buddhist) texts which show distinctively different features from Literary Chinese (LC), Early Medieval Chinese has been referred to as the “first vernacular revolution” by Mair (1994:717; and accordingly the emergence of highly vernacular LMC texts as a “second vernacular revolution” in the Chinese context), who also tries to determine the most important reasons for this development. Likewise, the transition to the colloquial Late Medieval Chinese takes place from circa 700 CE onwards, and might have been triggered by a larger context of committing spoken languages to a written form, taking place in Central Asia and North-western China, e.g., Old Uyghur (5th cent.), written Tibetan (mid-7th cent.); written Khotanese (from c. 700), and written Sogdian (from c. 700), and the multicultural and multilinguistic context of these regions (for an excellent concise discussion, see Takata 2000). In addition, Buddhist genres provided the ideal framework for the full surfacing of vernacular features (which might have been in use for a considerably longer time already), both syntactic and semantic, since their restrictions on style were far less rigid as compared to texts written in Literary Chinese.

Late Medieval Chinese texts show a significant amount of characteristics of the contemporary colloquial language of the Táng Dynasty

(618–907), and feature the very early usage of many syntactic markers still current in Modern Mandarin and other contemporary Chinese dialects.

This period is also characterized by the non-standardized usage of phonetic transcriptions of newly emerging function words, e.g. (note that the final stop *-t* in the 沒/勿 pronunciations probably had disappeared by the 10th century):

1. 異沒時作勿生。

Yìmò                      shí      zuòwùshēng.  
 /ji` (ji<sup>h</sup>)-mut/                      /tsuo` (tsu<sup>h</sup>)-mut-ʃian/  
 be.like (such)      time      how.about  
 ‘If it is like this what shall be done?’  
 (8th cent.; ms. Pelliot 3047; yìmò 異沒/zhǐmò  
 只沒 also appear in ms. Dūnbó 77)

In this phrase (which roughly corresponds to Modern Mandarin *zhème shí zěnmeyàng?* 這麼時怎麼樣?), the only Chinese character used semantically is *shí* 時 ‘when > if’, whereas all the other characters transcribe vernacular words which did not have a standardized graphical representation at that time.

During the early and mid-Sòng period (Sòng Dynasty: 960–1279) many of the Late Medieval Chinese texts were “sanitized” by removing phonetic loan characters typical for hand-copied texts (as evidenced by the Dūnhuáng 敦煌 manuscript remains) of the Táng, thereby streamlining the transcription of colloquial function words. A good example is the early development of Modern Mandarin *shénme* 什麼; the Chinese character 麼 became current in the early Sòng in order to represent the phoneme *mo/me* in colloquial function words (see for example Féng 2006):

[*héwù* 何物 (what thing → what)] ⇒ Circa mid- and late 8th century: 甚沒 [*Bǎolín zhuàn* 寶林傳, 801 CE], 是物, 是勿, 是沒 [ms. Dūnbó 77] (/ʃhimiuət/ /ʃhimiət/) ⇒ Circa late 8th–9th century: (是沒), 甚物, 甚摩 [ms. Stein 2503], 甚謨 [ms. Stein 2669] (/ʃhima/) ⇒ Circa late 9th–10th century: 什摩, 什磨 (/ʃhi<sup>m</sup>ma/ /ʃhimma/ /ʃhimmo/) ⇒ “Standard” form from the early 11th century onwards: 什麼

(phonetic reconstructions according to Jiǎng 1994:142; according to the reconstruction, the final stop *-t* disappeared some time during the late 9th or early 10th cent.)

Scholarly attempts to determine more accurate features of the periodization of Early Medieval Chinese/Late Medieval Chinese are merely at its very beginnings and have to await more detailed studies. This is also complicated by the fact that text styles and linguistic features of earlier periods continued to be used, and that the different genres (and the language used in them) constantly influenced each other. In addition, there is not necessarily a linear development from less to more vernacular textual features (for an attempt to quantify this genre-dependency, see Zimmer 1999). For example, many of the Buddhist Hybrid Chinese (BHC) translations dating from the Táng period tried to adapt to Literary Chinese principles to a much higher degree than earlier texts. The famous translator Kumārajīva (343–413 CE), for example, had a great impact on successive translation practices, and the intrusion of new vernacular elements into Buddhist Hybrid Chinese decreased (for a very good discussion on which Buddhist texts should be used for the study of vernacular elements, see Zürcher 1996; for a list of scriptures, see Zürcher 1996:28–31; on the constraints imposed by prosody and versification, see Zürcher 1996:10f.; for a concrete example of the techniques of “re-literalization” of a Buddhist narrative, see Anderl and Pons, forthcoming, 389–392). → Buddhist Hybrid Chinese style texts typical for Early Medieval Chinese also continued to be a dominant Buddhist written medium in the Late Medieval Chinese period, and fully vernacular features only appeared in the *dialogues* of a small number of Buddhist genres (for a very good concise overview of vernacular literature preserved in Dūnhuáng, see Schmid 2000; most importantly the *biànwén* 變文 ‘transformation texts’, the *jiǎngjīng wén* 講經文 ‘sūtra lecture texts’ and related genres, certain types of poetry, and the dialogue sections of the early treatises and historiographies of the Chán 禪 school; as for printed texts, the 10th century

*Zǔtángjí* 祖堂集 ‘Collection from the Patriarchs’ Hall’ (ZTJ) as preserved in an appendix to the Korean canon).

Genre dependence can also be deduced from the analysis of Early Medieval Chinese Buddhist texts: colloquial features (both in terms of the lexicon and syntax) mostly appear in the dialogue sections of narrative literature such as the *jātaka* (Birth stories, i.e., accounts of Buddha’s previous lives), *avadāna* (noble deeds), *nidāna* (i.e., accounts of Buddha’s life), or, more generally, collections of popular stories such as the *Bǎiyù jīng* 百喻經 [Hundred parables scripture] and the *Xiányú jīng* 賢愚經 [Scripture of the wise and foolish] (for an interesting comparison of LC and EMC features in parts of the *Xiányú jīng*, see Harbsmeier 2012). Among non-Buddhist Early Medieval Chinese texts, only relatively few show a significant amount of vernacular elements, such as the *Lùnhéng* 論衡 [The balance of discourses], the *Shìshuō xīnyǔ* 世說新語 [A new account of tales of the world], and (sections of) the Daoist *Tàipíng jīng* 太平經 [Scripture of great peace].

## 2. ASPECTS OF THE STUDY OF EARLY MEDIEVAL CHINESE

A broader interest in the study of Early Medieval Chinese only developed in recent years and since then certain aspects of Early Medieval Chinese grammar have received intense scholarly attention. This is exemplified by the numerous studies on various constructions, among them the passive (for a discussion of the various scholarly interpretations and ample bibliographical references, see Zēng, forthcoming) and object disposal forms (for references, see below). Concerning the passive construction, despite the great number of publications, there is as yet no coherent and convincing account of the development, let alone the transition from older strata of Chinese to the Hàn/Early Medieval Chinese periods. A close examination of Chinese and Western secondary literature on passives reveals some of the more general problems related to the approach to Early Medieval Chinese: during the last 20 years, there has been a strong focus on

tracing changes based on mechanisms as defined in various theoretical frameworks of historical linguistics. Whereas this has yielded many valuable insights, it also has led to certain oversights and shortcomings (see Zēng, forthcoming, showing that there is no mature passive with *wéi* 為 before the Hàn/early medieval period). Trying to mainly trace the developments of full words into function words, the exact analyses of syntactic features, as well as their pragmatic and idiomatic contexts have not received sufficient attention yet. In addition, important questions such as the restrictions and *constraints* on the use of passive need more investigation (Harbsmeier 2012:169), as well as the close study of the syntactic features of early translation literature.

There are very promising recent developments which eventually will enable a more systematic approach to and deeper understanding of the syntax of Early Medieval Chinese texts, such as the meticulous comparative studies on Buddhist translation literature, published in the form of word lists, comparative editions, and analytic studies (e.g., Karashima 1998, 2001a, etc.; Zacchetti 2005, 2007, 2012), the development of digital parallel corpora (e.g., *Thesaurus Literaturae Buddhicae*, TLB), and detailed studies on the development of specific constructions and systems (e.g., the immense complexity and the subtleties of the → medieval modal system; see especially Meisterernst 2008, 2010, 2011; for a rough outline of aspects of the LMC modal system, see Anderl 2004: vol. I, 384–435, 2006a). In addition, the important question of syntactic change has recently received renewed attention by Aldridge (2013), who emphasizes correctly that in passive sentences in the medieval period neither *wéi* 為 nor *bèi* 被 should syntactically be regarded as “coverb/preposition”, nor as “agent marker”, but as verbs with a sentential object.

Attempts to prove direct influences from Indic languages (e.g., Zhū Qìngzhī 1993; with rather doubtful conclusions concerning the interpretation of *suǒ* 所 in “passives”) on the development of specific markers and constructions in Early Medieval Chinese are only in an initial stage of scholarly research. This is especially true for the formative period of Early Medieval Chinese reflected in early translation literature, due the

lack of direct parallel texts. More often than not, it is not even clear on which source language a translation is based. Moreover, many early Chinese translations seem to be only rough renderings of specific Indic texts, or are even based on oral versions (see for example Mair 2012). Recently, meticulous philological studies on very early translations (and the distorted Chinese sometimes resulting from them) have produced important results concerning the understanding of Early Medieval Chinese texts. For example, Zacchetti (2007) analyzes the approach of Ān Shìgāo 安世高 (148–180 CE) and his translation technique of strictly following the syntax of Indic languages, which results in syntactic structures such as *zài fó* 在佛 reflecting ablative Pāli *buddhe* ‘from the buddha’). Consider the following Chinese sentence, which tries to faithfully follow the syntax of the Indic original, becomes enigmatic in the target language. The key structure of the Pāli phrase, marking *ajjhataṃ kāye kāyānupassī* ‘reflect the body in the body’ as a specification of *viharati* ‘he dwelt’, is lost in Chinese:

2. 比丘自身身身相觀行止。  
 Bǐqiū zìshēn shēn  
 monk self.body body  
 shēnxiàngguān xíngzhǐ.  
 body.characteristic.contemplation walk.stop  
 bikkhu ajjhataṃ kāye  
 monk.NOM inwardly.ADV body.LOC  
 kāyānupassī viharati. (Pāli)  
 body.reflect.PTCP dwell-3SG  
 (> concerning the body)  
 ‘A monk dwells contemplating (the nature of) the body in the body in regard to himself.’  
 (T.33, no. 1694. 173c-174a; translation based on Zacchetti 2007; the Pāli parallel and its English translation is taken from *Vibhaṅga*, 193)

More generally, it is assumed that for example the usage of plural markers *-děng* 等, affixed to human nouns, including pronouns, and *zhū*-諸, which developed from a quantifier marking members of a class to more generally plural in prenominal position, rather than meaning ‘all’ (clear marking of ‘all’ usually requires an addition, such as *yīqiè zhū* 一切諸), as well as the

frequent and non-typical usages of *ér* 而 (reflecting dependent infinitives?), the frequent use of *qí* 其 as definite article rather than pronoun (其 X ‘this X > the [aforementioned] X’; although this usage can be traced to much earlier periods, it reappears in Buddhist literature with a very high frequency) and the much higher frequency and varieties of “passives”, were possibly influenced by syntactic constructions of Indic source languages.

### 3. STRUCTURAL IMBALANCE AND SYNTACTIC FEATURES

One of the important features of Buddhist Hybrid Chinese is a “structural imbalance” between the parts of speech observed in many texts, often in stark contrast to compositional principles of Literary Chinese. Sentences often contain multiple coverbal phrases (coVP) preceding and modifying the (disproportionally short) main verb (V), in this example *jù* 俱 ‘dwell together’:

3. 佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園與大比丘眾千二百五十人俱。  
 Fó zài Shèwèi-guó Zhǐshù Jīgūdú-yuán  
 NPR COV NPR-country NPR NPR-garden  
 yǔ dà bǐqiū zhòng  
 COV great monk assembly  
 qiān-èr-bǎi-wǔ-shí rén jù.  
 NUM.1,250 person dwell

佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園與大比丘眾千二百五十人俱



‘The Buddha dwelled together (v) with (cov) an assembly of 1,250 great *bhikṣus* (monks) at (cov) Jetavana Anāthapiṇḍadārāma in Śrāvastī.’ (T.8, no.235, 748c)

In addition, in Buddhist texts there is often an attempt to express multiple time sequences by adding semi-grammaticalized verbs in final position. Nearly all of these verbs have the original semantics of ‘to end, finish’, such as *liǎo* 了, *yǐ* 已,

*qì* 訖, *jìng* 竟. In the following example, in order to mark a multiple temporal sequence of verbal phrases, the adverb *cìdì* 次第 ‘[sequence →] in the following sequence’ is added. In addition, there is a certain *variatio* by using synonymous expressions for marking the completion of action (twice *yǐ* 已 and once *qì* 訖 ‘[to end →] after...’):

4. 於其城中次第乞已還至本處飯食訖收衣鉢洗足已敷座而坐。

Yú qí chéng zhōng cìdì qǐ  
 in 3POSS town middle sequence beg  
 yǐ huánzhì běn chù fàn  
 finish return.arrive original place food  
 shí qì shōu yī bō xǐ zú  
 eat finish tidy cloth bowl wash foot  
 yǐ fū zuò ér zuò.  
 finish spread seat and sit

‘After (*yǐ* 已) they had begged in this city they returned to their original place (i.e., the monastery); after (*qì* 訖) they had eaten, and after (*yǐ* 已) they had arranged their garment and alms’ bowls, they spread their sitting mats and sat down.’

(T.235, *Jīngāng bōrěbōluómì jīng* 金剛般若波羅蜜經/*Vajracchedikā prajñāpāramitā jīng*, tr. in 402 CE by Kumārajīva)

In addition, one encounters a number of other fundamental problems in the analysis of Early Medieval Chinese texts: there is a significant unbalance of Early Medieval Chinese features as found in Buddhist texts compared to non-Buddhist literature. Research (and the resulting understanding) on Early Medieval Chinese will therefore be restricted by the genre and linguistic features of this type of texts (for a very good overview of different types of BHC texts, see Zürcher 1996; on the language of early translations, see McRae and Nattier 2012). Another aspect concerns the question to what extent texts of the medieval period reflect “natural” developments in the language and, as such, possibly reflect changes in the development of the spoken language (but see Nattier 1990 for BHC as a “church language”), or rather were “constructed” in the process of translation activities (for an interesting case study on the Chinese produced by

Ān Shīgāo in the course of his early translation activities, see Zacchetti 2007). This was probably also reinforced by the fact that translations frequently were the result of collective efforts in the framework of “translation teams” who worked at translation offices (*yìchǎng* 譯場; on the production process of translations, see for example Fuchs 1930; Tso 1963).

For instance, during the Six Dynasties period (3rd–6th century CE) more than 35 disyllabic quantifying adverbs with identical or nearly identical meaning (‘all; each’) were used in Buddhist texts (Chen 2008:58), in addition to numerous monosyllabic and even a few trisyllabic ones. Tables of distribution show that some of them were only used in Buddhist material, and others in both Buddhist and non-Buddhist texts, usually with significant differences concerning their frequency of occurrence. Despite the large amount of quantifiers, only very few have a high frequency, e.g., *jiēxī* 皆悉 and *xījiē* 悉皆 are clearly the dominating quantifiers in Buddhist texts of that period (for tables of distribution, see Chen 2008:66–69, 73–76). More generally, a huge diversification of adverbial modifiers can be observed (for an exhaustive list of adverbs in a historical perspective, see Hé 1994:1–258).

Changes in language use are disproportionately observable in Buddhist literature, and a number of reasons have been established for this phenomenon (see for example Mair 1994). Among Buddhist texts, usually those including lengthy, narrative passages and dialogues include more “colloquial” features. As such, narrative literature (or narrative passages in other Buddhist genres) such as the *jātaka*, *avadāna*, and *nīdana* are of great interest, in addition to the various compilations of Buddhist parables edited during the medieval period:

5. 我是王國中人，與盲父母俱來入山中，學道二十餘年，未曾為虎狼、毒蟲所見害，今便為王所射殺。

Wǒ	shì	wángguó	zhōng	
1SG	COP	king.country	middle	
rén,	yǔ	máng	fùmǔ	
person	with	blind	father.mother	
jù	lái	rù	shān	zhōng,
together	come	enter	mountain	middle

xué	dào	èr-shí	yú	nián,	wèicéng
study	way	20	more	year	never.ever
wèi	hǔ	láng,	dú	chóng	suǒ-jiàn
COV	tiger	wolf	poison	animal	PART.PART
hài,	jīn	biàn	wèi	wáng	suǒ
hurt	now	then	COV	king	PART
shè-shā.					

shoot-dead

‘I am a person from this kingly realm, having come together with my blind parents to enter the mountains (i.e., pursue ascetic practices); we have studied the Way for more than twenty years, and have never ever been hurt by tigers, wolves, or poisonous beasts; today, however, I have been shot dead by the King.’ (T.3, no.174, 437a)

In the translation of T.175, 442c (*jīn biàn wèi wáng jiàn suǒ shè-shā zhī* 今便為王箭所射殺之), there is an additional *zhī* 之; this is an interesting (and not unusual) case of a redundant usage of the 3rd person object pronoun *zhī* in a passive construction. It follows after the complex verb *shè-shā* ‘shoot dead’ despite *shā* being already “passivized” by the construction [*wéi* + agent + *suǒ* 所 + passivized verb]; and, indeed referring back to the patient which is the speaker himself! The example sentences also feature the EMC passive marker *suǒ-jiàn* 所見 (more common in early Buddhist translations, e.g., the *Lotus sūtra* translation of Dharmarakṣa; see Karashima 1998, 435–436, Karashima 2001, 261; Ōta 1988, 54).

#### 4. ACCUMULATIVE AND INFLATIVE FEATURES

In Early Medieval Chinese, and, to an even higher degree, in Late Medieval Chinese texts, one can often observe a certain “inflation” of grammatical markers and functions. On the one hand, a vast amount of grammatical markers have accumulated throughout the various periods of language development and they often co-appear in the very same Late Medieval Chinese text. These are sometimes unevenly distributed according to the structure of a text, e.g., the narrative passages in historiographical texts show markers typical for Literary Chinese

and Buddhist Hybrid Chinese, whereas in the dialogues vernacular markers will dominate. In some texts, obviously a “dual” system is used, for example for “what”-questions, a system based on *hé* 何 and compounds, and one based on the vernacular *shímó* 什摩, with near-identical meanings and functions. In addition, many markers of the Late Medieval Chinese period absorbed new usages or expanded their functional realm, thereby increasingly overlapping with other function words. For example, the coverbs of direction *cóng* 從 ‘from’ and *xiàng* 向 ‘to, towards’, were occasionally also used for indicating location (‘at; in’). Interestingly, untypical usages of *cóng* were recently also observed in the earliest Buddhist translation literature (*cóng jiè* 從戒 ‘by means of discipline’, reflecting *sīlena* ‘with discipline’; in the text analyzed by Zaccchetti 2007, *cóng* basically had assumed most of the functions of Literary Chinese *yǐ* 以 ‘with, by means of’).

Another example is the established Early Medieval Chinese interrogative *rúhé* 如何 ‘how’, which in Late Medieval Chinese is frequently used in syntactic environments preceding the copula *shì* for purposes of “topic raising” (*rúhé shì* 如何是 X ‘how about X?’). Some particles such as sentence final *yě* 也 accumulated so many functions (indicating nominal predicates, emphasis, requests/orders, questions, perfective aspect, etc.) and became so all-pervasive that the informativeness of *yě* marking decreased, and, by consequence, eventually led to the emergence or proliferation of alternative markers. In addition, rare, highly specialized, or dialect markers could surface in texts. In Chán texts, e.g., *lán* 攔 ‘block’ and *mò* 驀 ‘mount a horse’ could mark a body part which is negatively affected by an action: *shī biàn mò miàn tuò* 師便驀面唾 ‘Thereupon, the master spat him into the face’ (ZTJ, 2.026).

## 5. NOUNS, CLASSIFIERS AND PRONOUNS

In Late Medieval Chinese vernacular texts, the number of polysyllabic nouns increased further. One type of polysyllabic nouns frequently employed consists of reduplicated words, usually functioning as quantifiers (*zhǒngzhǒng* 種種 ‘all kinds of; various’), adverbs (*rìrì* 日日

‘daily’), or merely indicating plural (*zǔzǔ* 祖祖 ‘all patriarchs’). Occasionally, AABB patterns are encountered (*zhīzhīyèyè* 支支葉葉 ‘each branch and each leaf’).

Several semi-grammaticalized nouns (*hòu* 後 ‘behind’; *lǐ* 裏 ‘inside’; *nèi* 內 ‘inside’; *qián* 前 ‘in front of’; *shàng* 上 ‘above’; *xià* 下 ‘below’; *wài* 外 ‘outside’; *zhōng* 中 ‘in the middle of’; *zhōngjiān* 中間 ‘in between’) are often postposed to NPs, and have the function to localize the event relative to the NP they are attached to. Some of them are regularly attached to abstract nouns (*jiào zhōng yǐ hé wéi lǐ* 教中以何為禮 ‘What does one regard as propriety in [Buddhist] teaching?’, ZTJ 4.123).

The noun phrases can be highly complex and modifying NPs and VPs can be linked to the head by the vernacular particle *dǐ* 底 (the predecessor of Modern Mandarin *de* 的) or Literary Chinese *zhī* 之.

The system of classifiers of Late Medieval Chinese (for an overview, see Anderl 2004, vol. I:113–120) is highly complex, each classifier having an individual history of grammaticalization. Classifier phrases (i.e., num+clf) can be preposed to the noun although post-nominal usage is still frequently encountered. Wáng (1992) is a thorough study of Táng classifiers; basic patterns of classifier usage are treated in Peyraube (1998). Economic treatises among the Dūnhuáng manuscripts contain a wealth of information on classifiers (including extremely rarely used classifiers; for a recent study, see Hóng 2004):

### 6. 白羅壹段紫絛壹緇紬壹段色物三事。

Bái luó yī duàn zǐ shī yī  
white silk one CLF purple silk one  
fēichóu yī duàn sè wù sān shì.  
silk one CLF color thing three CLF  
‘One item of white silk gauze, one [item] of purple silk fabric, one item of bright red silk, three pieces of coloured things.’

(ms. Stein 5804)

By the middle of the 10th century, *gè* 箇/箇/个 had developed into the general purpose classifier (replacing EMC *méi* 枚). In addition to combining with any type of noun, it can co-appear with (demonstrative) pronouns (e.g., *nǎ-gè* 那

個 ‘which one’; *zhè-gè* 這個 ‘this one’), and with postpositions (*gè-lǐ* 個裏 ‘here’). The numeral ‘one’ can be deleted before *gè*.

One of the most important changes as compared to Literary Chinese is the appearance of *noun affixes*, e.g., prefixes *ā-* 阿 and *lǎo-* 老 (e.g., attached to family names). “Plural suffixes” such as *-bèi* 輩 and *-děng* 等 became commonly used after nouns with human referents. In Early Medieval Chinese there also emerged a small number of affixes which could attach to verbs and adverbs, such as *zì-* 自, probably in the process of building disyllabic compounds, e.g., *zìdāng* 自當 ‘necessarily, certainly’ (see Karashima 2001). However, the system of affixes did not fully develop before the Late Medieval Chinese period. Besides prefixes *ā-* and *lǎo-*, commonly used suffixes include *-tóu* 頭 (usually suffixed to concrete nouns, but also to some abstract nouns, localizers, and demonstratives, etc.), *-ér* 兒 (human and animal reference), and *-zǐ* 子 (human, animal, and concrete references).

There are also a few instances where suffixes attach to verbs, adverbs, and adjectives (e.g., *xiēzi* 些子 ‘little-adv’; *ruòzǐ* 若子 ‘like this, such’). Some suffixes developed specialized usages. Thus, from the Táng period, *-zǐ* combined with concrete nouns, where the resulting compound referred to low-status professions, e.g., *mén* 門 ‘gate’ + *zǐ* 子 > *ménzǐ* 門子 ‘gatekeeper’ (for an overview of LMC affixes, see Anderl 2004, vol. I:125–158). From the 10th century onwards, the vernacular verbal suffix *shēng* 生 (today still current in the →Wú 吳 dialect) became commonly used with VPs (emphatic: *tài gāo shēng* 太高生 ‘too lofty’, ZTJ, 1.150) and especially interrogatives (*shímóshēng* 是摩生 ‘what does that mean?’). Other verbal affixes and structure words in Late Medieval Chinese include *dǎ-* 打 (*dǎ-shuì* 打睡 ‘to sleep’); *-dāng* 當 (*shì-dāng* 試當 ‘to try’); *-duàn* 斷 (especially used in the *biànwén* literature, such as *wàng-duàn* 望斷 ‘to hope’); *qí* 其 (*biànwén* literature, such as *shuō-qí* 說其 ‘to speak’, *yǒu-qí* 有其 ‘have’); and *-yǒu* 有 (*zhī-yǒu* 知有 ‘to know’).

One of the systems which underwent most drastic changes concerns the use of pronouns in medieval Chinese texts. The exact circumstances of this development are no quite clear yet but

*wǒ* 我 had developed into the all-purpose first-person pronoun by Qín times, and has remained so since then. The development of *wú* 吾 is highly complicated and still a matter of scholarly research. From the Hàn period onwards, the usage of *wú* decreased (or became oblique) in many texts, or is distributed unevenly, depending on the region and/or translator (compare Lokaksema/Zhī Lóujiāchèn 支婁迦讖, born 147 CE in T.225, versus Zhī Qiān 支謙, fl. 222–252 in T.226, for example, *wǒ fùmǔ* 我父母 ‘my father and mother (parents)’: *wú qīn* 吾親 ‘my relatives/parents’; see Zürcher 1996:5). In the Late Medieval Chinese period it reemerged in colloquial Buddhist texts as emphatic first person pronoun (*wú shī* 吾師 ‘my master’). *Shēn* 身 (‘body’ → ‘I’) was occasionally used as first-person pronoun from the Six Dynasties period onwards. More rarely, the pronouns of Wú 吳 origin, such as *nóng* 濃 ‘I’ (Qin 1996:44), *wǒnóng* 我濃 ‘we’ and *nóngjiā* 儂家 ‘we’, are used. Among the newly emerging pronouns in Early Medieval Chinese/Late Medieval Chinese, there are also the deprecativ *mǒuyǐ* 某乙 ‘so-and-so’ → ‘I’ and *nú* 奴 ‘slave’ → ‘I’. We also find exotic varieties in the vernacular manuscript literature preserved in Dūnhuáng, such as *ānùshēn* 阿奴身 ‘pref.slave. body’ → ‘I’ (ms. Pelliot 2187), a self-derogatory first person pronoun for females (‘I, your slave’).

Among the second person pronouns, *rǔ* 汝 is the most important one. In Late Medieval Chinese, the 2nd person pronoun *nǐ* 你 and the 3rd person pronoun *tā* 他 (with occasional usages in pre-Táng times) became current. *Tā* also developed important modal functions in Late Medieval Chinese and successive periods, an issue not studied thoroughly so far. In Buddhist texts, *xiàng* 相 ‘each other → him/her/it’ started to be frequently used as 3rd person pronoun, proposed to the transitive verb (“unidirectional” *xiàng* as opposed to its original reciprocal usage, i.e., ‘each other’).

Besides Literary Chinese/Early Medieval Chinese *cǐ* 此 and *shì* 是 ‘this’, important demonstrative pronouns in Late Medieval Chinese include *zhě* 者/*zhè* 這. Short-range demonstratives can also express modality (usually derogative): *zhè ā-shī* 這阿師 ‘This monk!’ (ZTJ, 1.152). The common word for ‘here’ is *zhè-lǐ* 這裏. The most

important long-range demonstrative pronoun is *nà* 那, usually appearing with *gè* 個 in adnominal position (*nàgè rén* 那個人 ‘that person’).

Dozens of new disyllabic interrogative pronouns became common in Early Medieval Chinese. For example, the ancient all-purpose pronoun *hé* 何 is frequently used in compound forms. Although some of the compounds can be traced back to pre-medieval times, they developed into frequently used interrogatives only during the medieval period, especially in Buddhist texts, e.g., *rúhé* 如何 (for a list of interrogative pronouns, see Anderl 2004, vol. I:232–235). In Late Medieval Chinese, the system of interrogatives expanded immensely, including colloquial *nǎ* 那 ‘which’ (often prefixed: *ā-nǎ* 阿那, *ā-nǎ-gè* 阿那個 ‘which one’, *nǎlǐ* 那裏, *ā-nǎlǐ* 阿那裏), *nǎ-biān* 那邊 all ‘where?’, and also used in rhetorical question patterns such as *zhēng nǎ...hé* 爭那...何 ‘how is it possible that / how can it be that?’, *shímó* 什摩 ‘what’ (with derived compounds such *shímó-rén* 什摩人 ‘who’; *shímó-chù* 什摩處 ‘where’; *zuòshímó* 作什摩 ‘for what purpose’; *wèishímó* 為什摩 ‘why’; *gèshímó* 個什摩; *jí gèshímó* 急個什摩 ‘what’s the worry’ [ > relax!]? [ZTJ, 1.166]; *shímó-shēng* 什摩生 ‘what about’; and *zuòmó* 作摩 ‘how’; *zuòmóshēng* 作摩生 ‘how; how about’; *zuòmó-chù* 作摩處 ‘where’). Interrogatives with an antonymic morphemic buildup were occasionally already used in Early Modern Chinese, but increased in usage during later periods, cf., e.g., *zǎowǎn* 早晚 ‘early-late → when’; *duōshǎo* 多少 ‘many-few → how many’; *duōshǎoshí* 多少時 ‘many-few-time → when’, *dà-xiǎo* 大小 ‘big-small → what size’.

## 6. VERBS

One of the major developments concerning verb constructions is the consolidation of the copula *shì* (see also above). *Shì* appears in a variety of patterns, including emphatically postpositioning and indicating identity *X wǒ shēn shì yě* 我身是也 ‘X is my very body → is myself’. There is also an expansion of the functions of copulas, such as the marking of alternative questions, e.g., *wéi* 為 A B; *wéi* 為 A *wéi* 為 B ‘is it A or B?’; *zuò yǔ xíng wéi tóng bù tóng?* 坐與行為同不

同? ‘Is walking and sitting the same or not the same?’ (Ān Shìgāo, T.15, no.602, 166a). In these usages, the copula often was compounded with a suffix in Late Medieval Chinese. For a list of dozens of patterns with compounds, see Hé (1994:377–389).

The early medieval period also witnesses the development of complex *coverbal* (*prepositional*) *constructions*, some of them highly specialized (for an overview in a historical perspective, see Hé 1994:259–331 and especially Mǎ 2002), including many disyllabic and even trisyllabic function words. Frequently, the original semantics of the coverb is persevering, as in the following example:

7. 象坐牙死犀坐其角翠為毛故麝鹿為皮肉故。

Xiàng	zuò	yá	sǐ	xī
elephant	COV	tooth	die	rhinoceros
zuò	qí	jiǎo	cùi	wèi
COV	POSS	horn	kingfisher	COV
máo	gù	zhānglù	wèi	pí
feather	cause	deer	COV	skin
ròu	gù.			
meat	cause			

‘The elephant dies (i.e., is killed) *because of* his teeth, the rhinoceros *because of* his horn, the kingfisher bird *for* his feathers, and the Moschus deer *for* his skin and meat.’ (T.3, no.175a, 438c–439a)

Note the particular usage of *zuò* 坐 here, being used like a coverb expressing cause/reason. This usage is mentioned in Jiě (2008:1212–1213), and glossed as ‘based on, because of’. The usage seems to be derived from the lexical meaning ‘to be brought to justice’ and ‘to be liable for’ attested for in Qín and Hàn times (see for example Lau and Lüdtke 2012). Also note the *variatio* in the third and fourth phrases, using the more common *wèi* 為...*gù* 故 (‘because of...reason’) Literary Chinese construction.

In the following example, *lèi* 累 appears as part of a serial verb construction, functioning similar to a coverb, based on an extension of meaning ‘to trouble → cause’; the object of the main verb *gòngyǎng* 供養 is fronted and marked with the coverb *yǐ* 以:

8. 以我盲父母累王供養道人現世罪滅得福無量。

Yǐ wǒ máng fùmǔ  
 COV 1SG blind mother.father  
 lèi wáng gòngyǎng dàorén  
 trouble (>COV) king provide way.man  
 xiànrì zuì miè dé fú  
 present.age sin perish obtain merit  
 wúliàng.  
 not.have.measure

‘Troubling (→ causing) you, my King, to provide for my blind parents, then the present guilt of mine, the man of the Way, will be eradicated, and I will obtain merit without limitations.’

(T.3, no. 174, 437b)

Among the serial verb constructions, the “disposal form” (fronting the direct object of ditransitive verbs), most importantly the one marked with *jiāng* 將 (LMC: *bǎ* 把), has been studied thoroughly. Moreover, the functional realm of the pre-Buddhist *yǐ* 以 expanded significantly during that period, and could form various patterns. Based on the semantics ‘to take’, other verbs with similar meaning grammaticalized into this function by analogy, such as *qǔ* 取 ‘grasp’ (especially in early translation literature; see Cáo 2000; Yù 2000:555–556), *chí* 持 ‘hold’, and *zhuó* 著/着 ‘attach’. In narrative passages, the object was regularly disposed of in front of the main verbal phrase in constructions with ditransitive verbs. In the example below, the direct object is marked with *yǐ* 以, and the indirect object with *xiàng* ‘towards → to’ (usually with human objects and appearing with a restricted number of verbs indicating speech acts; see Anderl 2004, vol. 1, 334–335). This strategy of “differential object marking” was more commonly used from the Táng periods onwards, but there are occasional examples from earlier periods:

9. 王以談語向父母說。

Wáng yǐ Shǎn yǔ xiàng  
 king COV NPR word COV  
 fùmǔ shuō.  
 father.mother say

‘The king told Śyāma’s words to the parents.’  
 (T.3, no.175, 443b)

The parallel passage in a somewhat earlier translation shows a more complex and less transparent construction, featuring a redundant (or rather resumptive) third person pronoun *zhī* 之 after the main verb, referring back to the direct object disposed of by *yǐ* 以 (which is followed by a verbal phrase nominalized with *suǒ*):

10. 王具以談口中所言向盲父母說之。

Wáng jù yǐ Shǎn kǒu-zhōng  
 king ADV COV NPR mouth-LOC  
 suǒ yán xiàng máng fùmǔ  
 NMLZ speak COV blind father.mother  
 shuō zhī.  
 say 3PL

‘The King entirely told the parents what Shǎnzǐ had said (lit. inside his mouth).’

(T.3, no.174, 437c)

Also coverbal function words indicating the temporal and spatial frames of events expanded. Typically, coverbs indicating location grammaticalized from lexical words indicating movement.

In Early Medieval Chinese, a limited number of verb complements appeared, such as *V-sǐ* 死 (V and die) and *V-shā* 殺 (V and kill; see Méi 1991), e.g., *shè-shā* 射殺 (shoot and kill → shoot dead). However, the system of verbal complements did not fully develop before the Late Medieval Chinese period, when directional complements after verbs of motion became commonly used (e.g., *tuīchū sǐshī* 推出死屍 ‘drag that corpse out!’; ZTJ, 5.021; *fēiguò* 飛過 ‘fly by’; for occasional EMC examples, see Zürcher 1996:15; *yī shāmén lái-guò* 一沙門來過 ‘a monk came by’). The object is occasionally inserted between the main verb and its complement (e.g., *rù dìyù qù* 入地獄去 ‘[it is like] entering Hell’, ZTJ, 2.112). *Dé* 得 ‘attain → be able to’ is frequently used in postverbal position expressing capability (*dān-dé* 擔得 ‘able to carry’; *chū-bù-dé* 出不得 ‘not be able to escape’). *jiāng* 將, which in Early Medieval Chinese marks imminent action/intention, can move to postverbal position, often in the compound *jiāng lái* 將來,

adding the notion of a request or mild imperative (*qǐng héshàng dǎpò jiāng lái* 請和尚打破將來 ‘I request you, Preceptor, to destroy it’, ZTJ, 5.138). These complex verb phrases can combine with vernacular emphatic sentence finals (*bèi súhàn nòng jiāngqù zài* 被俗漢弄將去在 ‘[...] and will be made fun of by vulgar fellows’, ZTJ, 4.134). Other important complements include *-qǔ* 取 (indicating attainment/completion); *-què* 卻 (completion); *-zhào/zhe* 著/着 (completion or state/progression; e.g., *fùgài-zhe* 覆蓋著 ‘be covered’). For an overview of verbal complements in the transformation texts/*biànwén*, see for example Wú (1996:286–311).

#### 7. MARKERS OF MODALITY AND SENTENCE FINAL PARTICLES

One of the aspects which underwent most changes, is the modal system. The richness and complexity of modal markers manifests itself usually in the dialogue sections of the narrative passages (for recent studies of modal markers of the Hàn period and EMC, see Meisterernst 2008, 2011, 2012a; for a useful lists of function words of the modal system in a historical perspective, see Hé 1994:476–503; for modal verbs in LMC, see Anderl 2004, vol. I:385–435). The constituents of modal constructions include sentence initials, interrogative pronouns, a great variety of modal verbs, and sentence final particles. Among the last category, a variety of new markers emerged during the 4th and 5th centuries. One example is the vernacular sentence final particle *pó* 婆, appearing in a *Vinaya* translation at the end of the 4th century (T.24, no.1464). It marks interrogative sentences and is used like Literary Chinese *yé* 耶 and *hū* 乎. Karashima (1997) regards it as the predecessor of sentence finals such as *mó* 摩/磨 (→ *me* 麼 in early Mandarin), whereas others see it as phonetically related to *bù* 不 (Fēng 2000; see also Lóng 2004:36–37) in sentence final position. In Early Medieval Chinese, we also see an increasing usage of sentence finals marking yes/no questions, such as *bù* 不, *fǒu* 否, and *wèi* 未, the last one originally being ‘tensed’, maybe (see Harbsmeier 2012:83, fn.20).

In Late Medieval Chinese, the system of sentence final modal particles developed further,

including *hǎo* 好, expressing deontic modality, often interacting with the modal verb *xū* 須 (*xū zǐxi hǎo* 須子細好! ‘[You] should be careful’, ZTJ, 3.039; compare *zhe* 者/著/着 with the similar meaning of exhortation: *zǐxi siliàng zhe* 子細思量着 ‘Think carefully about it’, ms. Pelliott 2838) or double-negations. Particles giving emphasis to a statement include *lǐ* 裏/裡/俚 and *zài* 在 (*zhè-gè rén wèi chūjiā zài* 這個人未出家在! ‘This person hasn’t left home yet (i.e., is not a real monk yet)’, ZTJ, 2.048). Precursors of interrogative *ne* 呢 in Late Medieval Chinese include *nǐ* 你/甞/尼/唵/咏 (between the Southern Sòng until the Yuán, often replaced by *lǐ* 裏/里): *cǐ rén ne* 此人甞 ‘What about this person?’, ZTJ, 2.146. A related particle is *na* 那, with occasional Early Medieval Chinese examples (appearing in interrogative questions or conveying suggestive mood/mild imperative; see Zürcher 1996:18–19: *bǐqiū nǎ qu* 比丘那去 ‘Where did the monk go to?’). Sentence final *qù* 去 conveys the speaker’s conviction that an event/action will take place (or is desired to be realized) in the future, in addition to giving emphasis to the apodosis in conditional sentences (both factual and hypothetical): *yù mó zé wú shèng qù yě* 與摩則無聖去也 ‘If that’s the case then sages do not exist’ (ZTJ, 1.082).

Although the study of Medieval Chinese has progressed significantly during the recent years, there are many aspects which need further investigation, and studies have to be systematized and related to each other to a higher degree, in order to gain an understanding of the general development of Medieval Chinese grammar. Non-edited handwritten texts are of paramount importance for the research on Medieval Chinese. First of all, manuscripts dating from the early Hàn have to be further analyzed in order to determine the early use of some Early Medieval Chinese syntactic features. Systematic research on the syntactic features of Dūnhuáng manuscript texts are only in its initial phase, and will occupy linguists for the coming decades. Another important topic for future research will be early Buddhist translation literature, including comparative studies with Indic parallel texts. Last but not least, the relation between language and genre (and the genre constraints on language expression) will

need much more detailed studies in order to understand how features of Medieval Chinese language were committed to a written form.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

*Biànwén*: Xiàng Chǔ 項楚, ed., *Dūnhuáng biànwén xuǎnzù* 敦煌變文選注 [An annotated selection of Transformation Texts], vols. I–II, Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá 中華書局, 2006.

Dūnbó: Dūnhuáng manuscripts preserved at the Dūnhuáng bówùguǎn 敦煌博物館.

Pelliot: Dūnhuáng manuscripts preserved at the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Stein: Dūnhuáng manuscripts preserved at the British Library.

T.: Takakusu Junjirō, ed., *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 [Revised edition of the Buddhist canon in the Taishō-era], 100 volumes, Tōkyō: Daizō shuppan kai, 1922–1933.

TLB: *Thesaurus Litteraturae Buddhicae*, Jens Braarvig, ed., available on: <http://www2.hf.uio.no/polyglotta/index.php?page=library&bid=2> (last accessed May 19, 2016).

*Vibhaṅga*: Ānandajoti Bhikkhu, ed./tr., *Satipatt-hānavibhaṅgo (Vibh. 7): Analysis of the Ways of Attending to Mindfulness*, available on: <http://www.ancient-buddhist-texts.net/Texts-and-Translations/Satipatthana-vibhanga/Satipatthana-vibhanga.pdf> (last accessed December 30, 2014).

Zacchetti, Stefano, *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, 2005.

Zhōu Shàoliáng 周紹良 and Zhāng Yǒngquán 張涌泉, eds., *Dūnhuáng biànwén jiǎngjīngwén yīnyuán jíjiào* 敦煌變文講經文因緣輯校 [Collected Collations of the Transformation Texts, Sūtra Lecture Texts, and Nidānas from Dūnhuáng], vols. I–II, Nánjīng 南京: Jiāngsū gǔjī 江蘇古籍出版社, 1999.

ZTJ: *Zútáng jí* 祖堂集 [Mimeographic edition], in: Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, ed., *Zengaku sōsho* 禪學叢書 4 [Monographs in Zen studies], Tokyo: Chūmon 中文出版社, 1974.

References

Aldridge, Edith, “Survey of Chinese Historical Syntax Part II: Middle Chinese”, *Language and Linguistics Compass* 7/1, 2013, 58–77.

Anderl, Christoph, *The Language of Zútáng jí* 祖堂集, vols. I–II, Oslo: Unipub, 2004.

Anderl, Christoph, “Notes on the Development of Modal Verbs and Their Functions in Middle Chinese Texts”, in: Redouane Djamouri and Rint Syb-

esma, eds., *Chinese Linguistics in Budapest*, Paris: EHESS-CRLAO, 2006a, 17–32.

Anderl, Christoph, “Zen in the Art of Insult: Notes on the Syntax and Semantics of Abusive Speech in Late Middle Chinese”, in: Christoph Anderl and Halvor Eifring, eds., *Studies in Chinese Language and Culture—Festschrift in Honour of Christoph Harbsmeier on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, Oslo: Hermes Academic Publishing, 2006b, 377–393.

Anderl, Christoph, ed., *Zen Buddhist Rhetoric in China, Korea, and Japan*, Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Anderl, Christoph and Jessie Pons, *Representations of Buddhist Narratives Along the Silk Route: Dynamics of Text Corpora and Image Programs*, Leiden: Brill, forthcoming. [Page numbers refer to the draft version].

Cáo Guǎngshùn 曹廣順, “Wèi Jìn Nánběi-cháo dào Sòng-dài de ‘dòng + jiāng’ jiégòu 魏晉南北朝到宋代的‘動+將’結構” [The construction ‘verb + jiāng’ from the periods of Wèi, Jìn, the Southern and Northern Dynasties until the Sòng Dynasty], *Zhōngguó yǔyán* 中國語言 2, 1990, 130–135.

Cáo Guǎngshùn 曹廣順 and Yù Xiàoróng 遇笑容, “Zhōnggǔ yījīng zhōng de chùzhìshì 中古譯經中的處置式” [The disposal form in medieval sūtra translations], *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 中國語文 6, 2000, 555–563.

Chéng Xiāngqīng 程湘清, ed., *Wèi Jìn Nánběicháo Hànyǔ yánjiū* 魏晉南北朝漢語研究 [Research on the grammar of the Wèi, Jìn, and Southern and Northern Dynasties], Jīnán 濟南: Shāndōng jiàoyù 山東教育出版社, 1992.

Dǒng Kūn 董琨, *Hàn Wèi Liùcháo fójīng suǒ jiàn ruògān xīnxīng yǔfǎ chéngfèn* 漢魏六朝佛經所見若干新興語法成分 [Some new grammatical elements in the Buddhist scriptures of the Hàn, Wèi, and Six Dynasties periods], Nánjīng 南京: Jiāngsū gǔjī 江蘇古籍出版社, 1985.

Féng Chūntián 馮春田, *Wèi Jìn Nánběicháo shíqī mǔuxiē yǔfǎ wèntí tànjiū* 魏晉南北朝時期某些語法問題探究 [Investigation into some grammatical problems of the Wèi, Jìn, and Northern and Southern Dynasties], in: Chéng Xiāngqīng 程湘清, ed. 1992, 179–239.

Féng Chūntián 馮春田, *Xiàndài Hànyǔ yǔfǎ yánjiū* 現代漢語語法研究 [Studies in the grammar of Early Mandarin], Jīnán 濟南: Shāndōng jiàoyù 山東教育, 2000.

Féng Chūntián 馮春田, *Ywèn dàicǐ ‘zuòwù’, ‘shìwù’ de xíngchéng* 疑問代詞“作勿”、“是勿”的形成 [The formation of the interrogative pronoun zuòwù and shìwù], *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 中國語文 2, 2006, 135–141.

Fuchs, Walter, “Zur technischen Organisation der chinesischen Sanskrit-Übersetzungen” [On the technical organization of Sanskrit-Chinese translations], *Asia Major* 6, 1930, 84–103.

Guō Xīláng 郭錫良, “Guānyú xīcǐ ‘shì’ chǎnshēng shídài hé láiyuán lùnzhèng de jǐdiǎn rènshí 關於系詞“是”產生時代和來源論爭的幾點認識” [Several insights concerning the debate on the period

- of origin of copula *shì*], in: “Wáng Lì xiānshēng jìniàn lùnwénjí” biānwěihuì “王力先生纪念论文集” 编委会 [Collection of essays in memory of Mr. Wáng Lì editorial committee], ed., *Wáng Lì xiānshēng jìniàn wénjí* 王力先生纪念文集 [Collection of essays in memory of Mr. Wáng Lì], Běijīng 北京: Shāngwù 商务印书馆, 1990; reprinted in: *Hànyǔshǐ lùnjí* 汉语史论集, Běijīng 北京: Shāngwù 商务印书馆, 1997, 106–123.
- Harbsmeier, Christoph, “Reading the *One Hundred Parables Sūtra*: The Dialogue Preface and the *Gāthā Postface*”, in: Anderl, Christoph, ed., *Zen Buddhist Rhetoric in China, Korea, and Japan*, Leiden: Brill, 2012, 163–204.
- Hóng Yīfāng 洪藝芳, *Dūnhuáng shèhuì jīngjì wénshùzhōng zhī liàngcí yánjiū* 敦煌社會經濟文書中之量詞研究 [A study of classifiers in the texts on society and economics of Dūnhuáng], Taipei 臺北: Wénjīn 文津出版社, 2004.
- Hé Jīnsōng 何金松, *Xūcí lìshǐ cídiǎn* 虚词历时词典 [A diachronic dictionary of function words], Wūhàn 武汉: Húběi rénmín 湖北人民出版社, 1994.
- Jí Shìméi 吉仕梅, *Qín Hàn jiǎn bó yǔyán yánjiū* 秦汉简帛语言研究 [Studies in the language of bamboo and silk (remains) from the Qín and Hàn dynasties], Chéngdū 成都: Bāshū 巴蜀書社, 2004.
- Jiǎng Shàoyú 蔣紹愚, *Jīndài Hànyǔ yánjiū gàikuàng* 近代漢語研究概況 [A survey study on Early Mandarin], Běijīng 北京: Běijīng dàxué 北京大學出版社, 1994.
- Jiě Huìquán 解惠全, Cui Yǒnglín 崔永琳 and Zhèng Tiānyī 郑天一, eds., *Gǔshū xūcí tōngjiě* 古书虚词通解 [A thorough explanation of the function words in ancient books], Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá 中华书局, 2008.
- Karashima Seishi, “Vernacularisms and Transcriptions in Early Chinese Buddhist Scriptures”, in: Erik Zürcher, Seishi Karashima and Huanming Qin, eds., *Vernacularisms in Medieval Chinese Texts*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1996, 32–42.
- Karashima Seishi 辛島静志, *Hànyǔ fódǎn de yǔyán yánjiū—fūpiān: Fódǎn Hànyǔ sān tí—guānyú yǔqìcí ‘pó’, guānyú ‘bèiduō’, guānyú ‘jībīn’* 漢語佛典的語言研究—附片: 佛典漢語三提—關於語氣詞 ‘婆’ 關於 ‘貝多’ 關於 ‘罽賓’ [Research in the language of the Chinese Buddhist Scriptures—Appendix: Three issues on the Chinese of Buddhist syntax—Concerning the modal function word *pó*, concerning *bèiduō* (*‘pātra-leaf’*), and concerning *jībīn* (*‘Kashmir’*)], *Súyǔyán yánjiū* 俗語言研究 4, 1997, 29–49.
- Karashima Seishi 辛島静志, *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa’s Translation of the Lotus Sūtra* 正法華經詞典, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University, 1998.
- Karashima, Seishi, *A Glossary of Kumārajīva’s Translation of the Lotus Sūtra* 妙法華經詞典, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University, 2001a.
- Karashima, Seishi, “Underlying Languages of Early Chinese Translations of Buddhist Scriptures”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44, 2001b, 207–230.
- Karashima, Seishi, “Underlying Languages of Early Chinese Translations of Buddhist Scriptures”, in: Christoph Anderl and Halvor Eifring, eds., *Studies in Chinese Language and Culture—Festschrift in Honour of Christoph Harbsmeier on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, Oslo: Hermes Academic Publishing, 2006, 356–366.
- Lau, Ulrich and Michael Lüdke, *Exemplarische Rechtsfälle vom Beginn der Han-Dynastie: eine kommentierte Übersetzung des Zouyanshu aus Zhangjiashan/Provinz Hubei* [Exemplary legal cases from the beginning of the Han dynasty: An annotated translation of *Zouyanshu* from Zhangjiashan / Húběi Province], Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), 2012.
- Liáng Xiǎohóng 梁曉虹, *Fójiào yǔ Hànyǔshǐ yánjiū: Yǐ Riběn zīliào wéi zhōngxīn* 佛教與漢語史研究: 以日本資料為中心 [Research into Buddhism and the history of the Chinese language: With a focus on Japanese materials], Shànghǎi 上海: Shànghǎi gǔjí 上海古籍出版社, 2008.
- Liú Shìrú 劉世儒, “Wèi-Jīn Nánběi cháo gètǐ liàngcí yánjiū” 魏晉南北朝個体量詞研究 [Study on the individual classifiers of the Wèi-Jīn and Northern and Southern Dynasties periods], *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 中國語文 10/1, 1961, 26–40.
- Liù Shìzhèn 柳士鎮, *Wèi Jīn Nánběi cháo lìshǐ yǔfǎ* 魏晉南北朝历史语法 [A historical grammar of the Wèi, Jīn, and Northern and Southern Dynasties periods], Nánjīng 南京: Nánjīng dàxué 南京大學出版社, 1992.
- Lóng Guófú 龙国福, *Yáo-Qín yìjīng zhùcí yánjiū* 姚秦译经助词研究 [Research on the function words of translated *sūtras* of the period from 351 to 394], Chángshā 长沙: Húnán shīfàn dàxué 湖南师范大学出版社, 2004.
- Mǎ Bèijiā 马贝加, *Jīndài Hànyǔ jiècí* 近代汉语介词 [Prepositions of Early Mandarin], Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá 中华书局, 2002.
- Mair, Victor, “Buddhism and the Rise of the Written Vernacular in East Asia: The Making of National Languages”, *The Journal of Asian Studies* 53/3, 1994, 707–751.
- Mair, Victor, “The Khotanese Antecedents of *The Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish (Xianyu jing)*”, *Sino-Platonic Papers* 222, 2012, 150–178.
- Méi Zǔlín 梅祖麟, “Táng, Sòng chǔzhìshì de lái yuán” 唐宋处置式的来源 [The origin of the Tang and Song disposal constructions], *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 中國語文 216, 1990, 191–206.
- Méi Zǔlín 梅祖麟, “Cóng Hàndài de ‘dòng-shā’ ‘dòng-sǐ lái kàn dòngbǔ jiégòu de fāzhǎn” 從漢代的 ‘動—殺’ ‘動—死’ 來看動補結構的發展 [The development of the verb-resultative construction from ‘V-kill’ and ‘V-die’ in the Han period], *Yǔyánxué lùncóng* 語言學論叢 16, 1991, 112–136.

- Meisterernst, Barbara, "Modal Verbs in Han period Chinese Part II: Negative Markers in Combination with the Modal Auxiliary Verbs *kě* 可 and *kěyǐ* 可以", *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* 37/2, 2008, 197–222.
- Meisterernst, Barbara, "Object Preposing in Classical and Pre-Medieval Chinese", *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 19, 75–102.
- Meisterernst, Barbara, "From Obligation to Future? A Diachronic Sketch of the Syntax and the Semantics of the Auxiliary Verb *dāng* 當", *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* 40/2, 2011, 137–188.
- Meisterernst, Barbara, "A Syntactic Analysis of Modal *bì* 必: Auxiliary Verb or Adverb?", in: Cao Guangshun, Hilary Chappell, Redouane Djamouri and Thekla Wiebusch, eds., *Breaking Down the Barriers: Interdisciplinary Studies in Chinese Linguistics and Beyond*, Taipei: Academia Sinica 2012a, 425–449.
- Meisterernst, Barbara, "Number in Chinese: A Diachronic Study of the Case *zhū* 諸 From Han to Wei Jin Nanbeichao Chinese", in: Xu Dan, ed., *Quantification and Plurality, Number and Person in the Languages of Asia*, Berlin: DeGruyter, 2012b, 143–182.
- Meisterernst, Barbara, "Vernacular Elements and Literary Language in Han Period Chinese: A Linguistic Comparison of Corresponding Chapters in the *Shiji* and the *Hanshu*", paper presented at the *Symposium on The History and Current State of Written Chinese*, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, May 2011, 2013a.
- Meisterernst, Barbara, "Hàncháo Hànyǔ wényán zhōng de kǒuyǔ chéngfèn: Shǐjì yǔ Hànsū duìyǐng juàn de yǔyánxué bǐjiào yánjiū 汉朝汉语文言中的口语成分: “史记”与“汉书”对应卷的语言学比较研究 [Colloquial elements in the Literary Chinese of the Han Dynasty: A comparative linguistic study of corresponding chapters of the *Shiji* and *Hanshu*]", in: Féng Shènglì 冯胜利, ed., *Hànyǔ shūmiànyǔ de lìshǐ yǔ xiànzhuàng 汉语书面语的历史与现状 [The history and current state of written Chinese]*, Běijīng 北京: Běijīng dàxué 北京大學出版社, 2013b.
- Nattier, Jan, "Church Language and Vernacular Language in Central Asian Buddhism", *Numen* 37/2, 1990, 195–219.
- McRae, John and Jan Nattier, eds., "Buddhism across Boundaries: The Interplay of Indian, Chinese, and Central Asian Source Materials", *Sino-Platonic Papers* 222, 2012.
- Peyraube, Alain, "On the History of Classifiers in Archaic and Medieval Chinese", in: Benjamin Tsou, ed., *Studia Linguistica Serica*, Hong Kong: City University Press, 1998, 131–145.
- Qin, Huanming, "Illustrative Examples of Vernacularisms in the Poetry of the Six Dynasties Through Sung", *Sino-Platonic Papers* 71, 1996, 43–50.
- Schmid, D. Neil, "Tun-huang Literature", in: Victor Mair, ed., *The Columbia Encyclopedia of Chinese Literature*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2010 [2002], 964–988.
- Takata, Tokio, "Multilingualism in Tun-huang", *Tun-huang and Turfan Studies (Acta Asiatica: Buttetin of the Institute of Eastern Culture)* 78, 2000, 49–70.
- Táng Yù míng 唐钰明, "Hàn-Wèi Liùcháo bèidòngshì lüèlùn 汉魏六朝被动句式略论 [A short discussion of the passive construction during the Hàn, Wèi, and Six Dynasties periods], *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 中国语文 3, 1987, 216–223.
- Táng Yù míng 唐钰明, "Táng zhì Qīng de 'bèi' zì jù 唐至清的‘被’字句" [The passive sentence with *bèi* from the Táng until the Qīng], *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 中国语文 6, 1988, 459–468.
- Táng Yù míng 唐钰明, "Zhōnggǔ 'shì' zì pànduàn jù shù yào 中古‘是’字判断句提要" [An account of copula sentences with *shì* in the Medieval Period], *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 中国语文 5, 1992, 394–399.
- Tso Szu-bong [Cáo Shìbāng] 曹仕邦, "Lùn Zhōngguó fójiào yìchǎng zhī yǐjīng fāngshì yǔ chéngxù 論中國佛教譯場之譯經方式與程序" [On methods and procedures in the field of Chinese translations of Buddhist scripture], *Xīn-Yā xuébào* 新亞學報, 1963, 239–321.
- Wèi Déshèng 魏德胜, "Shuǐhǔdì Qín mù zhùjiǎn" yǔfǎ yánjiū "睡虎地秦墓竹简" 语法研究 [Research in the language of the Qín grave bamboo slips from Shuǐhǔ], Běijīng 北京: Shǒudū shīfàn dàxué 首都师范大学出版社, 2006.
- "Wáng Lì xiānshēng jìniàn lùnwénjí" biānwěihui "王力先生纪念论文集" 编委会 [Collection of essays in memory of Mr. Wáng Lì editorial committee], ed., *Wáng Lì xiānshēng jìniàn wénjí* 王力先生纪念文集 [Collection of essays in memory of Mr. Wáng Lì], Běijīng 北京: Shāngwù 商务印书馆, 1990.
- Wáng Shào xīn 王紹新, "Tángdài shīwén xiǎoshuō zhōng míngliàngcí de yùnyòng 唐代诗文中小说中量词的运用" [The usage of noun classifiers in poems, prose, and novels during the Táng dynasty], in: Chéng Xiāngqīng 程湘清, ed., *Suí Táng Wǔ-dài Hànyǔ yánjiū* 隋唐五代汉语研究 [Research on the grammar of the Suí, Táng and Five Dynasties periods], Jīnán 济南: Shāndōng jiàoyù 山東教育出版社, 1992.
- Wèi Péiquán 魏培泉, "Dōng-Hàn Wèi Jìn Nánběicháo zài yǔfǎshǐ-shàng de dìwèi 東漢魏晉南北朝在語法史上的地位" [The role of the Eastern Hàn, Wèi, Jìn, and Northern and Southern Dynasties periods in the historical development of syntax], *Hànxué yánjiū* 漢學研究 18, 2000, 199–230.
- Wèi Péiquán 魏培泉, *Shànggǔ Hànyǔ dào zhōnggǔ Hànyǔ yǔfǎ de zhōngyào fāzhǎn 上古漢語到中古漢語語法的重要發展*, in: Hé Dà'ān, ed., *Gǔjīn tōngsāi: Hànyǔ de lìshǐ yǔ fāzhǎn 古今通塞: 漢語的歷史與發展* [Opening up a passage between ancient and modern: The history and development of Chinese], Taipei 臺北: Zhōngyāng yánjiūyuàn yǔyánxué yánjiūsuo chóubèichù 中央研究院語言學研究所籌備處, 2003, 75–106.
- Wèi Péiquán 魏培泉, *Hàn-Wèi-Liùcháo chéngdàicǐ yánjiū* 漢魏六朝稱代詞研究 [Research in the personal pronouns of the Hàn, Wèi, and Six Dynasties

- periods], Taipei 臺北: Yǔyánxué yánjiūsuǒ 語言學研究所, 2004.
- Wú Fúxiáng 吳福祥, *Dūnhuáng biànwén yǔfǎ yánjiū* 敦煌變文語法研 [Research in the grammar of the Transformation Texts], Chángshā 長沙: Yuèlù shūshè 岳麓書社, 1996.
- Yáng Xīquán 楊錫全, *Chūtǔ wénxiàn 'shì=' jù qiǎnxī bùzhèng yizé* 出土文獻“是”句淺析補證一則 [An initial analysis of copula sentences in excavated material], 2009, available on: [http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/SrcShow.asp?Src\\_ID=1028](http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/SrcShow.asp?Src_ID=1028) (last accessed May 01, 2016).
- Yú Lǐmíng 俞理明, “*Tàipíngjīng* zhōng fēizhuàngyǔ dìwèi de fǒuding wèn ‘bù’ hé fǎnfù wènjù “*太平經*” 中非狀語地位的否定問‘不’和反復問句” [Negator *bù* in not-adverbial position in the *Tàipíngjīng* and A-not-A interrogative sentences], *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 5, 2001, 466–470.
- Yú Lǐmíng 俞理明, “Cóng Dōng-Hàn wénxiàn kàn Hàndài jùmò fǒuding cí de cíxìng 從東漢文獻看漢代句末否定詞的詞性” [The word class of Han dynasty sentence final negation words, based on Eastern Han texts], *Hànyǔshǐ xuébào* 漢語史學報 4, 2012, 36–41.
- Yú Xīnlè 余心樂 and Sòng Yílín 宋易麟, *Gǔhànyǔ xūcí cídiǎn* 古漢語虛詞詞典 [A dictionary of ancient Chinese function words], Nánchāng 南昌: Jiāngxī jiàoyù 江西教育出版社, 1996.
- Zacchetti, Stefano, “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 Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2006* 10, 2007, 395–416.
- Zacchetti, Stefano, “La costruzione pretransitiva nelle traduzioni buddhiste di epoca Han” [The disposal construction in Han Buddhist translations], in: Francesca Congiu, Barbara Onnis and Cristina Pinna, eds., *Cina. La centralità ritrovata* [China: Regaining centrality], proceedings of *XII Convegno dell'Associazione Italiana Studi Cinesi (AISC)* [The twelfth congress of the Italian Association for Chinese Studies (AISC)], September 2009, Cagliari: AIPSA Edizioni, 2012.
- Zeng Jianhong, “The Evolution of ‘wei A (zhi) suo V’ from a Copula to Passive Construction”, forthcoming.
- Zhū Qīngzhī 朱慶之, “Shìlùn Hàn-Wèi-Liùcháo fódǎn lǐ de tèshū yíwèncí 試論漢魏六朝佛典里的特殊疑問詞” [On special interrogative pronouns in Buddhist scriptures of the Han, Wei, and Six Dynasties periods], *Yǔyán yánjiū* 語言研究 1, 1990, 75–82.
- Zhū Qīngzhī 朱慶之, “Guānyú yíwèn yǔqì zhùcí ‘nà’ láiyuán de kǎochá 關於疑問語氣助詞‘那’來源的考察” [A study on the origin of the interrogative modal auxiliary particle *nà*], *Gǔhànyǔ yánjiū* 古漢語研究 2, 1991, 24–28.
- Zhū Qīngzhī 朱慶之, “Fódǎn yǔ zhōnggǔ Hànyǔ cíhuì yánjiū 佛典與中古漢語詞匯研究” [A study of the relationship between Buddhist scriptures and the vocabulary of Medieval Chinese], dissertation, Sichuan University, 1992.
- Zhū Qīngzhī 朱慶之, “Hàn-yì fódǎn yǔwén zhōng de yuándiǎn yǐngxiǎng chūtān 漢譯佛典語文中的原典影响初探” [A preliminary research concerning the influence of the source text in the Chinese translations from the Han period], *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 中國語文 5, 1993, 379–385.
- Zimmer, Thomas, *Baihua: Zum Problem der Verschriftung gesprochener Sprache im Chinesischen* [Baihua: On the problem of the transition from spoken to written language in Chinese], Sankt Augustin: Steyler, 1999.
- Zürcher, Erik, “Late Han Vernacular Elements in the Earliest Buddhist Translations”, *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association* 12, 1977, 177–203.
- Zürcher, Erik, “Vernacular Elements in Early Buddhist Texts: An Attempt to Define the Optimal Source Materials”, *Sino-Platonic Papers* 71, 1996, 1–31.
- Zürcher, Erik, “Buddhism across Boundaries: The Foreign Input”, *Sino-Platonic Papers* 222, 2012, 1–25.

Christoph Anderl