

《金光明经》蒙文、卫拉特本

N.Yakhontova

内容提要：作为大乘佛教经典中的重要著作，《金光明经》被译作蒙文和卫拉特。在佛教向其他国家传播的过程中，蒙文和卫拉特译本是由梵文原始文本翻译而来的各种译本的最后两种。在蒙文译本中，现知道有长（31 品）、中（29 品）、短（21 品）三种版本，皆收于蒙文《甘珠尔》中。长、中本间的差别在于长《金光明经》末尾多了二品，既《菩提树神赞欢品第二十九》和《大辩才天女赞欢品第三十》。中和短《金光明经》间的关系则较为复杂，有些品次缺于短《金光明经》中，有些则与中《金光明经》所含品次不吻合。不过，其他品次完全一致。发现于三种版本中的《金光明经》经文是相同的。其实，因为这三种版本都是译自藏文本，他们之间长短的差异是由藏文本间的异同造成的。作为单行本，三种版本中，只有 29 品的中《金光明经》以单行本形式在蒙古得到了广泛流传。圣彼得堡两个重要馆藏地所藏的几件《金光明经》是此译本的副本，其中，圣彼得堡大学东方系馆藏 9 件副本，东方研究院圣彼得堡分所藏有 14 件。据说，短《金光明经》主要是卫拉特本，也可以说只有托忒蒙文本。卫拉特语即西部蒙古所用方言，它经由著名通事、学者、政治家、清释咱雅班智达南卡嘉措（1599—1662）努力而成为可书写的文字。咱雅班智达用托忒蒙文翻译《金光明经》时，未使用已有的蒙文译本，而是直接从藏文本译至卫拉特本。他在较短的时间内完成了 200 多部著作的翻译，作为翻译家，他最具有创造性的工作是他翻译的方法。其翻译方法的核心是最精确地遵照藏文原本。他试图去统一词汇，并在结尾附藏文文法规则，为此，有时较大地改变了本民族的语言习惯和文法。

The Mongolian and Oirat translations of the Sutra of Golden Light

N.Yakhontova

Abstract: Being one of the principal works of Mahayana Buddhism the Sutra of Golden Light was translated in Mongolian and Oirat. Mongolian and Oirat translations are the last ones in the chain of translations from Sanskrit original texts in the course of Buddhist advance to other countries. In Mongolian three versions of the Sutra of Golden Light are known: long (31 chapters), medium (29 chapters) and short (21 chapters). All three are found in the Kandjur. The difference between the long and the medium versions is adding of two chapters at the end of the long version, containing praises to bodhisattvas and buddhas. The correlation between the medium and the short ones is more complicated: some chapters or passages are absent in the short and in some places the division into chapters doesn't coincide, but still other chapters are absolutely identical. The text of the Sutra which is found in all three versions is the same. Actually as all three versions were translated from Tibetan the changes concerning the size of the versions were made on the

Tibetan level.

In the form of separate editions and manuscripts only the medium version of 29 chapters was widely spread in Mongolia.

In the two main collections in St.Petersburg there are several copies of this version of the Sutra of Golden Light. At Oriental Faculty of St. Petersburg University there are 9 copies and at St.Petersburg branch of Institute for Oriental Studies there are 14 items.

The short version is known mainly through Oirat manuscripts which, on the other hand, represent the only known version in “clear script”.

Oirat i.e. the West-Mongolian language gained its written form due to the efforts of an outstanding clergyman, scholar and politician Zaya-pandita Namkhajamco [1599-1662]. Having invented new “clear script” Zaya-pandita didn't use already made Mongolian translations but carried out his own ones from Tibetan into Oirat. He translated about 200 works in a comparatively short period of time and his extremely productive work as a translator may be due to his method of translating. The essence of his way of translation was the most accurate following the original Tibetan text. He aimed to unification in lexis and repeating Tibetan grammar patterns in the latter case sometimes going as far as breaking grammar rules of his native language.

Being one of the principal works of Mahayana Buddhism the Sutra of Golden Light was translated in Mongolian and Oirat. Mongolian and Oirat translations are the last ones in the chain of translations from Sanskrit original texts in the course of Buddhist advance to other countries.

Mongolian texts.

In Mongolian three versions of the Sutra of Golden Light are known: long (31 chapters), medium (29 chapters) and short (21 chapters). All three are found in the Kandjur [Ligeti]. The difference between the long and the medium versions is adding two chapters at the end of the long version, containing praises to bodhisattvas and buddhas. Besides some paragraphs are occasionally missing in the medium version. The correlation between the medium and the short ones is more complicated though changes are mechanical: some chapters or passages (written in prose not verse) are absent in the short and in some places the division into chapters doesn't coincide, but still other chapters are absolutely identical. E.g. chapters 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 18, 27 from the medium version are omitted in the short one, chapters 1, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 are preserved (under different numbers), pairs of chapters: 11 and 12, 16 and a part of 17, another part of 17 and 18 form chapters 7, 9 and 10 correspondingly being shortened at the same time. The text of the Sutra which is found in all three versions is the same. Actually as all three versions were translated from Tibetan the changes concerning the size of the versions were made on the Tibetan level.

In the form of separate editions and manuscripts only the medium version of 29 chapters was widely spread in Mongolia.

In the two main collections in St.Petersburg there are several copies of this version of the Sutra of Golden Light.

At Oriental Faculty of St. Petersburg University there are 9 copies [Uspensky] and at St.Petersburg branch of Institute for Oriental Studies there are 14 items not to count fragments [Sazykin]. Among them there are 5 xylographs: two wellknown xylographs printed in 1659 and 1721 in

Peking, two Buriat ones and one Mongolian. There are 6 manuscripts written in old Mongolian script in colophones of two of which translator Sherab Senge is indicated.

Besides division into chapters it is divided into larger parts (in some places division is made inside a chapter) – ten of them are typical for Peking blockprints, 11 has one of two Buriat editions.

All of them as I have said represent the medium version the one which was widespread among the Mongols. However, one Mongolian blockprint has 21 chapters which is not typical for the Mongolian texts of this Sutra, the only one being in Gandjur.

At the same time the short version is known mainly through Oirat manuscripts which, on the other hand, represent the only known version in “clear script”.

Oirat texts.

The number of known Oirat manuscripts is quite large (e.g. there are 30 in the collection of Institute of Language and Literature of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences, Ulan-Bator, Mongolia [Gerelmaa]). One printed copy was known to be preserved in Ulan-Bator dated 1741 call number 111 [Luvsanbaldan]. (It should be mentioned that oirat xylographs are extremely rare). But this xylograph seems to have been lost – it is not mentioned in the recently published catalogue of this collection.

In the collection of our Institute there is only one manuscript of the Golden Light Sutra in Oirat and 4 are preserved at the Oriental faculty of the University.

All Oirat manuscripts (as well as the text published by Haenish [Haenish]) seem to correspond to one translation made by Zaya-pandita Namkhajamco.

Oirat i.e. the West-Mongolian language gained its written form due to the efforts of an outstanding clergyman, scholar and politician Zaya-pandita Namkhajamco [1599-1662]. In the year 1648 he introduced a new upgraded version of the old Mongolian script. It got the name “*todo bičig*” or “clear script” because its aim was to make the written language clear bringing it closer to the colloquial speech.

Preserving the majority of old Mongolian letters Zaya-pandita eliminated the polysemy of graphical signs. He modified writing of some letters, added some diacritical signs and restricted usage for the others. As the result the new script got two different letters for consonants *t* and *d*, it differentiated between soft and strong vowels having separate signs for vowels *a* and *e*, *ü* and *u*, *ö* and *o*. The most evident difference between two scripts was that inter-vocal consonants which were not existent in the language even at the time of the Secret History were not written in “clear script”. The long vowels were marked in two ways: by diacritical marks for *a* and *e* and by reduplication of letters for labial vowels. Still some writings were preserved from old Mongolian script: e.g. so-called “breaking of *i*”.

One thing is not clear enough concerning the “clear script”. Whether this script was only to be used by the Oirats or it was aimed for the whole Mongolian World. Scholars (at least in Kalmykia and Russia) haven’t reached mutual agreement concerning this point.

In theory any text written in old Mongolian script could have been easily converted into “clear script” by following new spelling rules (to some extent it can be compared to the way how nowadays those whose native script is Cyrillic use Latin letters to communicate by e-mail in their own language).

In spite of the innovations in spelling the relation between two ways of writing was so close that on the one hand it was easy to switch from one to the other but on the other hand the same easy

switching could be carried out backwards when old forms automatically appeared in writing.

Zaya-pandita didn't use already made Mongolian translations but carried out his own ones from Tibetan into Oirat. The indisputable result of Zaya-pandita's activities was the translation of a large amount of works: 186 works were translated by him personally and another 36 by his pupils (here I refer to his biography published by prof. A. Sazykin [Biography], numbers 177 and 37 were known before). One of the first in this list is Altan Gerel 'Golden Light'.

The Oirat version has 21 chapters and 5 larger divisions. The correlation between Oirat version and the medium Mongolian one (we compare with Mongolian since medium Oirat is not known) is the same as shown above for Mongolian, which is not surprising because both were translated from Tibetan.

It is necessary to make one remark: Zaya-pandita's biographer wrote that all the translations had been made during the period from one year of a tiger till another, i.e. in 12 years' period of time. The first year of tiger after 1648 (the year of creation of "clear script") was 1650, the next was 1662. It is supposed that since the biography had no information as to the number of cycles, it seems most probable that the amount of Zaya-pandita's translations covered the period not of 12 but of 24 years beginning from the previous year of tiger and including his translations in old Mongolian script which he had carried out before the "clear script" was developed. Though this supposition has been accepted as the only one which can explain Zaya-pandita's extremely productive work as a translator there is some other evidence concerning his method of translating which may probably give another explanation to the speed of his work.

Having been trained in Tibet Zaya-pandita knew the Tibetan language perfectly. The essence of his way of translation was the most accurate following the original Tibetan text and this manner of translation is different from other known Mongolian translations of Altan Gerel. (But was characteristic of his other translations as shown in [Cendina]).

The comparison of two texts one in Tibetan and the other in Oirat (using Mongolian text as an arbiter) gives some proof of his method of "computer translation".

In his attempt to follow the Tibetan original Zaya-pandita aimed to unification in lexis and repeating Tibetan grammar patterns in the latter case sometimes going as far as breaking grammar rules of his native language. His translation shows how, on the one hand, many linguistic phenomena were rendered following Tibetan text but, on the other hand, natural Oirat patterns were preserved.

Tibetan influence can be found in lexicology, morphology and syntax.

Lexicology.

The main principle here is "one Tibetan word is translated by one Oirat and it is to be the same Oirat word through the whole text". It doesn't mean using special Oirat words but just unification of the Tibetan-Oirat translation. E.g. tib. *mya-ngan* 'sorrow', tib. *ngal* 'exhaustion', tib. *sdug-bsngal* 'suffering' are translated as oir. *γasalang*, oir. *alzaxu*, oir. *zobolong* correspondingly having the same meanings. (Mongolian translation has *jobolong* in all three cases.) If a word is compound in Tibetan it will be translated by two words in Oirat, e.g. tib. *dbang-phyug* 'powerful' will be oir. *erketü erke id*.

Personal and geographical names are translated word to word without any additional explanatory word while Mongolian text adds it. E.g. the names of bodhisattvas most likely will be accompanied with the word "bodhisattva" in Mongolian but never in Oirat text.

Morphology.

In the Oirat translation plural suffix *-noγoud* is prevailing. It corresponds to Tibetan particle *rnams*. Suffix *-noγoud* is used not only instead of other possible suffixes, e.g. oir. *tenggeri-noγoud* ‘gods’ instead of *tenggeri-ner* id., oir. *ibēl ügei boluγsan-noγoud* ‘those who became unprotected’ instead of *ibēl ügei boluγsad* id., but where its use is excessive, e.g. oir. *dörbön moyoi-noγoud* or *γazar γal üsün kigēd kei-noγoud* ‘land, fire, water and air – all’. In the first example there is numeral “four”, in the second the nouns are uncountable and the meaning of *-noγoud* is collective. It is noteworthy that in those cases where Tibetan has plural *dag* or no plural at all where it could have been Zaya-pandita felt more free and used other “natural” suffixes (e.g. *xatun-i nököd* ‘friends of hatun’, *xamuq burxad* ‘all buddhas’). Besides two words *köüken* ‘son’ and *nökör* ‘friend’ occasionally appear with two plural suffixes *köüked-noγoud* and *nököd-noγoud* when the first is the one which should be used according to Oirat grammar and the second translates Tibetan *rnams*. But these cases are extremely rare.

The system of noun cases in Tibetan is similar to that of Oirat language. The case indicated in Tibetan was translated by the similar case in Oirat. Though the case used in Tibetan was repeated in Oirat mostly when it didn’t distort the meaning (e.g. *dörbön züqtü burxan-noγoud* ‘buddhas in four directions’ is used in parallel with *dörbön zügiyin burxan-noγoud* ‘buddhas of four directions’, depending on the case (Dative versus Genitive) used in Tibetan while Mongolian translation has only Genitive in this phrase. Oir. *nige egešiq doun-du* ‘in one melodical voice’ can be found parallel with *nige doun-yēr* ‘in one voice’. The first translates tib. *skad dbyangs gcig-tu* the second tib. *sgra-skad gcig-gis*. Mongolian has Instrumental case in both phrases. Reciprocal relations will have oir. *tögüsün* or *tögüsüksen* ‘complete’ to translate tib. *ldan* ‘possessing’ and Reciprocal case (*-tai*) for tib. *can* – possessive particle. If an attribute in Tibetan has Genitive marking it will be preserved in Oirat. Otherwise it may be reciprocal or none as in Tibetan. Accusative has no special marking in Tibetan and its use was not influenced by the latter.

Another typical feature of the Oirat translation is an excessive use of the verb *üyiledkü* ‘to do’, which corresponds to Tibetan *gyur* or *byed* id. Mostly it is just an auxiliary part of the verbal predicate though sometimes it has causative meaning. Only beware of its Tibetan use one can explain abundance use of this verb in the Oirat translation. Since in Oirat *üyiledkü* has no auxiliary use and causation is expressed by a special suffix in Oirat. In Zaya-pandita’s translations it may be expressed by means of the verb *üyiledkü*. Conjunction *kigēd* ‘and’ is used throughout the Oirat translation instead of more common *ba* ‘and’.

Syntax

Syntax is the sphere where the translator’s strive for accuracy violated the Oirat grammar rules. The word order in Tibetan is different from Oirat in first place in the position of an attribute which in Tibetan if unmarked stands in postposition to its determinate. You can find postpositioned attributes in the text of Oirat Altan Gerel as well, which is against Oirat grammar structure. E.g. oir. *erdem ayui yekei uxan üyiled* ‘let me understand the enormous wisdom’, oir. *yeke čoq zali sedkiši ügei-lügē tögüskü boluyu* ‘will possess large unthinkable glory’. Here not only the attribute is postpositioned but it has case markings. Some phrases appear to be not only incorrect but their meaning is misleading. E.g. oirat phrase *ilaγuqsan tede bügüde-dü süzülün mürgümüü* ‘I worship all those victorious’ might be understood as ‘the victorious one worships all those’ because of the postposition of the attribute. Oir. *xān ... xarši ilangγuya γaruqsan-du odun üyiledkü* ‘khan went to a especially outstanding palace’ could be understood as ‘khan left when (or because) the palace appeared in full’, when *γaruqsan* understood as the predicative of a time (or cause) clause.

To sum up Zaya-pandita used his own pattern of translation which might have allowed him to do accurate (in his understanding) and quick translations from Tibetan into Oirat.

[Biography] – Ратнабхадра. Лунный свет: История Рабджам Зая-пандиты. Факсимиле рукописи. Перевод с ойратского Г.Н.Румянцева и А.Г.Сазыкина. Транслитерация текста, предисловие, комментарий, указатели и примечания А.Г.Сазыкина. Санкт-Петербург, 1999. (Ratnabhadra. The Moon's light: a Biography of Rabjam Zaya-pandita. Translation from Oirat).

[Cendina] – А.Д.Цендина. Два монгольских перевода тибетского сочинения «Книга сына». // Mongolica V. Санкт-Петербург, 2005. (Two Mongolian translations of Tibetan “Bu chos”).

[Gerelmaa] – Brief catalogue of Oirat manuscripts kept by Institute of language and literature by G.Gerelmaa. // Corpus scriptorum Mongolorum. T. XXVII, fasc. 1. Ulaanbaatar 2006.

[Haenish] – E.Haenisch. Altan Gerel, die Westmongolische Fassung des Goldglanzsūtra. Leipzig 1929.

[Ligeti] – L.Ligeti. Catalogue du Kanjur mongol imprimé, Budapest, 1942.

[Lubsanbaldan] – Х.Лувсанбалдан. А.Бадмаев. Калмыцкое ксилографическое издание сутры «Алтан гэрэл». // 320 лет старокалмыцкой письменности. Материалы научной сессии. Элиста 1970. (Kh. Lubsanbaldan. A.Badmaev. The Kalmyk blockprint edition of sutra “Altan gerel”).

[Sazykin] – Каталог Монгольских рукописей и ксилографов Института востоковедения РАН. т. 1-3, М. 1988-2003. (The catalogue of manuscripts and xylographs in the Institute of Oriental Studies RAS. T. 1-3. Moscow 1988-2003.)

[Uspensky] – Catalogue of the Mongolian manuscripts and xylographs in the St.Petersburg State University library. Compiled by Vladimir L.Uspensky with assistance from Osamu Inoue. Edited and Foreword by Tatsuo Nakami. Institute for study of languages and cultures of Asia and Africa. Tokyo, 1999.