

《維摩詰經》敦煌藏文寫本殘卷 PT610、PT611 研究*

林純瑜**

摘 要

J. W. de Jong 於 1955 年所發表有關 PT610、PT611 兩份敦煌藏文寫本殘卷的考察曾被 Étienne Lamotte 引用，據以判定《維摩詰經》曾被譯成藏文不只一次。然而 de Jong 論文中大部分的篇幅是 PT610、PT611 兩份寫卷和甘珠爾傳本的藏文對音對照，並未針對 PT610、PT611 和甘珠爾傳本之間的差異進行詳細的分析和討論。本文首先比對 13 個甘珠爾傳本中之對應經文，嘗試經由各本之間的差異推演《維摩詰經》甘珠爾傳本之傳承關係與體系，然後分析 PT610、PT611 和各甘珠爾傳本之間的文句異同和關係。研究結果顯示，根據書寫型式推斷，PT610 的年代較 PT611 早；同時，無論從語詞、語法或句構等方面觀察，PT610

2017.1.9 收稿，2017.6.14 通過刊登。

* 本文為佛光大學佛教研究中心「維摩經與東亞文化」研究計畫 2015 年度（2015 年 8 月至 2016 年 7 月）子計畫「《維摩詰經》藏文寫本對勘」之研究成果。文中所使用之大部分參考文獻皆仰賴該子計畫及筆者於臺灣科技部之專題研究計畫「《維摩詰經》藏本譯者——兼論西藏佛典翻譯史觀」（MOST 104-2410-H-431-018-MY2）提供之研究經費取得。筆者於此特向佛光大學佛教研究中心和臺灣科技部表達謝意。此外也要感謝法鼓文理學院圖書館慷慨提供數種館藏甘珠爾中所收之《維摩詰經》予筆者無償使用。本研究初稿〈再論敦煌藏文寫本殘卷 PT610、PT611——《維摩詰經》早期藏文寫本研究〉曾於 2016 年 10 月 15-17 日由佛光大學佛教研究中心主辦之「第三屆維摩經與東亞文化國際學術研討會」中發表。會後經修改之文稿由《臺大佛學研究》送審。感謝審查人之評論與寶貴意見。本文乃參考審查意見，再次修改內容而成。

** 作者係佛光大學佛教學系助理教授。

與甘珠爾傳本之間的歧異甚大，顯然非屬同一譯本體系。此外，由比對結果可推測 PT611 是滕邦瑪族群之遠古始祖，但沒有任何跡象可證明 PT611 和蔡巴族群之間存在關聯。本研究之結果確立兩份敦煌寫本殘卷的價值：PT610 的存在證明《維摩詰經》有不只一個藏文譯本；PT611 的內容透露《維摩詰經》藏文本經文曾經經過大幅調整。

本文所觀察之經文段落並非《維摩詰經》全文，有關《維摩詰經》甘珠爾傳本關係方面的討論也只是初步的考察。儘管如此，期待本文的初步探討能增進國內學界對甘珠爾傳本研究的認識與興趣，未來有更多年輕學者願意投入目前仍在迅速發展的相關研究領域之中。

關鍵詞：敦煌藏文寫本、PT610、PT611、維摩詰經、甘珠爾

An Investigation into the Tibetan Dunhuang Manuscripts on *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* PT610 and PT611

Lin, Shen-yu *

Abstract

The study of the two Tibetan Dunhuang manuscripts PT610 and PT611 by J. W. de Jong in 1955 was taken by Étienne Lamotte as an important reference to posit that the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* had been translated into Tibetan more than one time. Instead of analyzing and discussing the differences between PT610, PT611 and the Kanjur versions, de Jong's paper was devoted in large part to the collation of the transliteration of PT610, PT611 and the Kanjur versions. Until now no contribution has been made to investigate the relationship between different Kanjur versions of the Tibetan *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, let alone the condition of their transmission. Taking PT610 and PT611 as the main subject of investigation, this study first compares the corresponding sūtra text in 13 Kanjur versions of the Tibetan *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, and aims to deduce the transmission relationship between the Kanjur versions according to variant readings. The differences in wording and syntax between PT610, PT611 and the Kanjur versions as well as their correlations are then examined. The research results show that according to the writing patterns, PT610

* Assistant Professor, Department of Buddhist Studies, Fo Guang University.

predates PT611. Moreover, PT610 deviates significantly from the Kanjur versions in wording, grammar, and syntax, suggesting that PT610 and the Kanjur versions are not descendants from the same translation. Besides, PT611 should be the ancestor of the Them spang ma group, whereas no relationship can be found between PT611 and the Tshal pa group. This study confirms the value of the two Dunhuang manuscripts; while the existence of PT610 indicates that *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* was translated into Tibetan more than one time, the content of PT611 reveals the fact that the Tibetan version of *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* was previously revised in large scale.

This study only examines a small section of the whole sūtra text. Thus the discussion on the relationship between different Kanjur versions in this paper can only be accounted as a preliminary examination. However, this paper contributes to the enhancement of understanding and interest in the research of Tibetan Kanjurs in Taiwan, and is offered in the hope that young scholars will be induced to delve into the related research area, which is still undergoing rapid development.

Keywords: Tibetan Dunhuang manuscripts, PT610, PT611, *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, Kanjur