西域歷史語言研究集刊

Historical and Philological Studies of China's Western Regions

目　録

Contents

Did Zaya Paṇḍita Translate the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* Twice?

Natalia Yampolskaya

The biography of *Zaya paṇḍita Nam mkha'i rGya mtsho* (1599–1662) titled "The Moonlight" (Oir. *sarayin gerel*) lists the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* sutra[①] as one of the 186 texts translated by the great Oirat scholar.[②] His biographer and disciple *Ratnabhadra* does not specify which of these scriptures were written down in the Mongolian script, and which in the Clear Script (Oir. *todo bičiq*). There has been some controversy as to the time period when these translations took place, because the list of *Zaya paṇḍita*'s works is introduced as the texts translated "from the tiger year to the tiger year" (Oir. *baras ǰil-ēce baras ǰil kürtele*).[③] As *Ratnabharda* does not indicate the elements of these tiger years, there are three possible ways to understand these dates: 1638–1650 (1638 being the year when *Zaya paṇḍita* returned from Tibet), 1650–1662 (after he created the Clear Script in 1648 and until he passed away), or 1638–1662. The latter version has been argued as the most believable one: it covers the period starting from *Zaya paṇḍita*'s return from Tibet, when he was actively travelling and teaching in the Mongolian and Dzungar lands.[④]

Today the literary legacy of *Zaya paṇḍita* is known to almost entirely consist of works in *todo bičiq*, although his biography suggests that he started translating Tibetan scriptures at least seven years prior to the introduction of the new alphabet in 1648. According to *Ratnabhadra*, in 1641 the Mongolian *ǰasaγtu qayan* asked his teacher to translate the *Pha chos* (part of the highly venerated

---

① The *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, often referred to as the "Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines" (Tib. *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa brgyad stong pa*; Mong. *Bilig-ün činadu (kiǰayar-a) kürügsen nayiman mingγa-tu*; Oir. *Biligiyin činadu kürüqsen nayiman mingyan-tu*).

② Radnabhadra, "Lunniy svet": istoriya rabdzham Dzaya-pandity. Faksimile rukopisi; perevod s oyratskogo G. N. Rumyantseva i A. G. Sazykina; transliteratsiya teksta, predisloviye, primechaniya i ukazateli A. G. Sazykina (Sankt-Peterburg, 1999), p. 166. The *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (Oir. *naiman mingyan šülüqtü*) is the sixth on the list, but nothing suggests that the texts are mentioned in a chronological order.

③ Radnabhadra, *"Lunniy svet"*, p. 166 (f. 8v of the manuscript, lines 10–11).

④ This version was set forth by Aleksei Sazykin in: A. G. Sazykin, *"O periodizatsii perevodcheskoi deyatel'nosti oiratskogo Dzaya-pandity"* // Pis'mennye pamyatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. XII godichnaya nauchnaya sessiya LO IV AN SSSR (kratkie soobscheniya). Chast' 1 (Moskva, 1977). pp. 134–140.

scripture of the Tibetan *bKa' gdams* school), and in 1643 he translated another voluminous collection of texts, *Ma Ni bka' 'bum* (a corpus of teachings traditionally attributed to the king *Srong btsan sgam po* of Tibet), while staying at *Ölǰeitü keyid* on the river Irtysh with *Dalai darqan čorǰi*. The latter account is supported by the information from the colophon, as the Mongolian translation of *Ma Ni bka' 'bum* has come down to us in a Beijing blockprint.[①]

Few other Mongolian translations attributed to *Zaya paṇḍita* are known today. Three are kept at the Institute of Oriental Manucripts, St. Petersburg (IOM RAS). One of them is a late 17th century copy of the *Mahāmokṣa* sutra (Tib. *Thar pa chen po*) in Mongolian, preserved in fragments and attributed to *Zay-a paṇḍita* based on its colophon. The text was examined by György Kara who found that it almost literally coincides with the Oirat versions of the same sutra, suggesting that it could be initially translated into Mongolian and later re-written in the Clear Script.[②] Another Mongolian translation by *Zaya paṇḍita* preserved at IOM RAS is that of the *Vajracchedikā* sutra. Aleksei Sazykin compared this manuscript with two other versions of the same text in the Clear Script that have two different colophons. One of them partly reproduces the colophon of the Mongolian translation, and the text appears to be a re-write of the Mongolian one in *todo bičiq*. The other version in the Clear Script is a "genuine Oirat composition".[③] In a similar way Sazykin proved that the Oirat version of the story of *Chos skyid ḍākinī* is a re-write of *Zaya paṇḍita*'s own earlier Mongolian translation.[④] These cases show that it was not uncommon for *Zaya paṇḍita* to rework his early translations into Oirat after he created the Clear Script. It can be gathered from the instance of the *Vajracchedikā* sutra that at times he chose to create new translations even when a re-write in the Clear Script had already been available.

The collection of IOM RAS holds another rare manuscript (shelfmark Mong. Q1) that contains the Mongolian translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* sutra by *Zaya paṇḍita*.

---

① The blockprint is described by Walther Heissig in: Walther Heissig, *Die Pekinger lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache: Materialien zur mongolischen Literaturgeschichte* (Wiesbaden, 1954), No. 24. Valuable commentaries were given by György Kara in: György Kara, *Books of the Mongolian Nomads: More Than Eight Centuries of Writing Mongolian*, trans. John G. Krueger, Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series 171 (Bloomington, 2005), pp. 140–41 and note 243. G. Kara erroneously refers to the place of translation as *Ablai-yin keyid* (also known as Ablaikit), however the monastery of *Ablai tayiǰi* was not constructed until 1657. Both the biography and the colophon of the blockprint suggest that the translation took place at another monastery in that area — *Ölǰeitü keyid*, also known as *Darqan čorǰi-yin keyid*.

② Kara, *Books of the Mongolian Nomads*, pp. 142–43.

③ Aleksei G. Sazykin, György Kara, "A Fifth, Anonymous, Mongolian Translation of the 'Diamond Sutra'" // *Mongolian Studies*, Vol. 22 (1999), pp. 71–72.

④ Istoriya Choidzhid-dagini. Faksimile rukopisi / Transliteratsiya teksta, perevod s mongol'skogo, issledovanie i kommmentariy A. G. Sazykina. Otv. red. S. Y. Neklyudov (Moskva, 1990), pp. 38–42.

His Oirat translation of the same text has come down to us in a xylographic edition and at least one manuscript, which allows to compare the Mongolian and Oirat texts. This paper proceeds to look into the differences between them in an attempt to define the kinship between the two works of *Zaya paṇḍita.*

The text sources are briefly described below. The Oirat translation is the first to be discussed, because its colophons are intact and provide helpful data to base further arguments upon. The colophon of the Mongolian manuscript is partly damaged, and an account of this source will be more advantageous when preceded by the description of the Oirat one.

The Oirat Translation

This paper refers to the Oirat blockprint and manuscript published in Inner Mongolia in 2015 and 2016 (abbr. Oir.Xyl and Oir.Ms).[1]

The text has several colophons. First, the translation of the Tibetan colophon of the sutra (Oir.Xyl ff. 379r–381v; Oir.Ms. ff. 379r–382v). In the Tibetan tradition the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* is known in three versions referred to as *phreng ba can, gzo sbyangs* and *sde can.*[2] *Zaya paṇḍita* based both his translations, Mongolian and Oirat, on the most widely spread version — *phreng ba can.* Various editions of *phreng ba can* share the same basic colophon, in shorter and longer versions, which attributes the original translation of the sutra to *Śakyasena, Jñānasiddhi* and *Dharmatāsīla. Zaya paṇḍita* based his Oirat translation on a Tibetan edition that had an extended version of the colophon, very close to (but not identical with) those found in the *Phug brag* and Shey (*Shel mkhar*) manuscript Kanjurs: the colophon proper is followed by verses compiled from fragments of the *Maṅgalagāthā* and other texts. So far I have not located a Tibetan version the colophons of which would fully coincide with that translated by *Zaya paṇḍita.*

The Tibetan colophons are followed by the Oirat one (Oir.Xyl. ff. 381v–382r; Oir.Ms.

---

① The manuscript was published in: Ili-yin γool-un urusqal daγau oron-du qataγalaγdaǰu bayiγ-a todo üsüg-ün surbulǰi bičig-ün čiγulγan, 1 (öbör mongγool-un keblel-ün bölüglel, öbör mongγol-un soyol-un keblel-ün quriy-a, 2015). The blockprint was published in: Ili-yin γool-un urusqal daγau oron-du qataγalaγdaǰu bayiγ-a todo üsüg-ün surbulǰi bičig-ün čiγulγan 5 (tabuduγar boti) (öbör mongγool-un keblel-ün bölüglel, öbör mongγol-un soyol-un keblel-ün quriy-a, 2016). Two xylographs of the same edition are preserved at the Institute of Language and Literature, Ulaanbaatar. See: G. Gerelmaa. Brief Catalogue of Oirat Manuscripts kept by Institute of Language and Literature, Vol. Ⅲ. (Ulaanbaatar, 2005), № 455, 592[1].

② For more information on the Tibetan versions of see: Fabrizio Torricelli, "Un Libro Sacro Tibetano Nella Collezione De Filippi al Museo Nazionale d'Antropologia e Etnologia Di Firenze", *Archivo per l'Antropologia e La Etnologia* CXXIX (1999), pp. 273–285; Fabrizio Torricelli and Nikolai N. Dudka, "Manuscript LTWA No. 23476. A 'SDe Can' Sample of the BrGyad Stong Pa", *Tibet Journal*, No. 24 (2) (1999), pp. 29–44.

ff. 382v–383r) — 20 lines of alliterated verses that praise the sutra and state that it was translated by *Zaya paṇḍita* at the request of *Giškib* and *Cevang Cecen tayiji*, singlehandedly written down on wooden boards by *Ratnabhadra*, and then copied onto paper by the scribe *dGe 'dun Bzang po*, assisted by *dge slong Chos rgya mtsho*.[①] This reflects the practice of translation that *Zaya paṇḍita* is known to have followed: he did not write the text down, but translated orally while a disciple wrote the draft version on wooden boards covered with fat and ash. Later the draft was checked and the edited version was re-written on paper.

The blockprint edition has an additional colophon (f. 382r), according to which the text was edited (in order to correct the mistakes of the scribes who had copied *Zaya paṇḍita*'s translation over the years) and printed by the order of *dGa' ldan Tshe ring* khan (r. 1727–1745) in the water-dog year (1742).[②] The text of the manuscript is very close to that of the blockprint, but there are variant readings. It is not known which of these editions is closer to the original wording of *Zaya paṇḍita*. This is a problem researches have to face when it comes to dealing with the legacy of the creator of the Clear Script, as the absolute majority of texts attributed to him are only known through sources that date back to a much later period than his lifetime.

The Mongolian Translation

The Manuscript Q1 (abbr. Mong.Q1) from the collection of IOM RAS is the only copy of this translation widely known today.[③] In the absence of a large part of the colophon the authorship of *Zaya paṇḍita* can only be deduced based on certain stylistic characteristics of the translation, as well as its vocabulary. György Kara was the first to draw attention to these peculiarities, as well as to the fact that it was one of the oldest discovered sources to preserve a text translated by *Zaya paṇḍita* (he believes that the manuscript dates back to the 17th century).[④] Previously I have published a comprehensive account of this manuscript, as well as agruments in favour of G. Kara's

---

① Oir.Xyl. f. 382r, lines 8–18: aburidan dēdü ɣurban erdeni-yi takiqči giškib kigēd: anggidaxui ügei sücüqtü čevang cecen tayiji terigüüten duraduqsan-du:: toyin rab 'by°m ża ya paṇḍida nayiroulun orčiulbai: todorxoi uxātu radna bhadra tong ɣaqčār samuradan: tonilxu-yi kereqleqči ketürkei bičiči dge 'dün bżangpo cāsun-du bičin: dousuqsan burxani kereqleqči dgeslong cos rgy°mčo demnen bičibei::

② Oir.Xyl. f. 382r, lines 23–34: ene nayiman mingɣatuyin suduri: urida rab 'by°m pa xutuqtuyin gegēn kür-büülüqsen-ēce: zabsar-tu bičiči terigüteni erkēr üleqsen tasuraqsan endüüreqsen bügüdeyi: šarayin šaḣini öqligöyin ezen dgā ldan čering vangpotani zarliyār: lamrim dge slong bżangpo rgy°mčo: tos bsam gling dge slong bkraši rgy°l čan: dge slong lhun grub rgy°mčo: dge slong zung drung dar dgy°s: nayiman mingɣatuyin yeke tayilbur kigēd ariun eke bičigüüd-tu tulɣan olon merged-ece asaqči šüügēd: usun noxoi ḣildü mongɣol-yēr kebtü daruulbai::

③ The manuscript is listed in the catalogue of the collection: A. G. Sazykin, *Katalog mongol'skikh rukopisey i ksilografov Instituta vostokovedeniya Rossiyskoy Akademii nauk.* Tom II (Moskva, 2001), № 2639.

④ Kara, *Books of the Mongolian Nomads*, p. 142 and note 245.

hypothesis,[①] which are summarised below.

The last intact folio of the manuscript (f. 387) contains the main part of the Tibetan colophon of the sutra. Although only a small piece of the next folio (f. 388) has survived, its *recto* side preserves fragments of seven lines of text that show that the colophon continued. In the table below the fragments of text that can be seen on folio 388r are presented in the first column, while the second and third columns demonstrate the respective passage from this colophon in the Oirat translation, and the Tibetan text (the corresponding words are shown in bold type):

Mongolian (Q1)	Oir.Xyl.	Tib. Phug brag Kanjur Vol. 39[1]
[388r] Jiči basa čöb čaɣ–daki (…) lêçau–a ḍpal rinčên čo(…) hindkeg töbüd–ün olan bi(…) oyoyata arilɣan ese üiled(…) –un töbüd–ün darumal bičig (…) (…) mnga ri rabyamba ḍ(…) (…) ügülegči toyin (…)	[379v] **xarin basa cöb cagiyin** xamugi medeqči: yeke žalu **kelemürči coq erde-ni nom** tedküqči sayini kigēd: **enedkeq töbödiyin olon sudur** neyilöülʝi: maši **sayitur arilɣan üyiledüqsen eke kigēd:** enedkegiyin xoyor sudur kigēd: **töbödi-yin darumal sudur**–noɣoudi neyilöülʝi: āky°yin gelüng **mnga gri rab 'byam pa coq** učiral ilaɣuqsan belge kigēd: xoyor kelēr **ögöüleqči toyin** bükün tālaqči sayin nom xoyoula: ···	[436v] **slar yang gnyis dus kyi** thams cad mkhyen pa chen po// zha lu **lo tsA ba dpal rin chen chos** skyong bzang po'i zhal snga nas kyi **rgya bod kyi dpe du ma** dang bstun nas shin tu **rnam par dag par mdzad pa'i ma phyi** dang/ rgya dpe gnyis dang/ **bod dpe par ma** rnams la gtugs te/ shAkya'i dge slong **mnga' ris rab 'byams pa dpal** 'byor rgyal mtshan dang/ skad gnyis **smra ba'i btsun pa** kun dga' chos bzang gnyis kyis/

1. The colophon of the *Phug brag* Kanjur volume is quoted here, because its text is very close to the edition used by *Zaya paṇḍita* (the actual edition that he used is not known).

Not only does this comparison prove that this is indeed the continued colophon of the sutra, it also highlights one of the important differences between the Mongolian and Oirat texts in question — the way names and titles are rendered. In the Mongolian text the Tibetan words are left in their original form, while in the Oirat one most of them are translated: the term *lo tsA ba* (translator) becomes *kelemürči*, and even some of the personal names are mongolised (Tib. *dpal rin chen chos skyong* — Oir. *coq erdeni nom tedküqči*; Tib. *dpal 'byor rgyal mtshan* — Oir. *coq učiral ilaɣuqsan belge*; Tib. *kun dga' chos bzang* — Oir. *bükün tālaqči sayin nom*). Translating names this way is not the most commonly used approach, and the fact that *Zaya paṇḍita* chose to follow it suggests that he strove to make the text sound natural in his native language.

The verso side of the damaged folio contains fragments of another six lines of text:

[388v] (…)uɣsan:: küčün–ü erketü (…)ünide orosiqui kiged: (…) kölgen delgeregülkü-yin tula: (…)-tur sayitur bütügeǰ: (…)ge-yin egüden negebei:: bi(…) (…)güden: oyun tegüsügsen: (…)

---

① Natalia Yampolskaya, *Jadamba. Eight Mongolian Translations of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā sūtra*, Asiat-ische Forschungen 158 (Wiesbaden, 2018), pp. 48–52; N. V. Yampolskaya, *"'Ashtasahasrika-pradzhnyaparamita' v mongol'skom perevode oyratskogo Dzaya-pandity"* // Strany i narody Vostoka XXXV (Moskva, 2014), pp. 391–401.

I have not located corresponding passages in the other Oirat or Tibetan colophons of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, which goes to show that this Mongolian translation did not contain the longer version of the Tibetan colophon that one finds in the Oirat translation by *Zaya paṇḍita*. I assume that the colophon ended at the part that describes the editing lineage (which would correspond to the words *salyan arilyan üyiledbei*, f. 380r, line 3 of the Oir.Xyl), and did not continue with the verses that one finds in the blockprint (f. 380r, line 3 — f. 381v, line 31). The fragments of text on folio 388v must belong to the original Mongolian colophon, but they are too short to reconstruct it.

The most distinct characteristic of this Mongolian translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* is its vocabulary which contains specific terms used in the other works of *Zaya paṇḍita*, and not typically encountered in classic Mongolian texts: *ilay-un tegüs(-ün) ülegsen* instead of *ilaǰu tegüs nögčigsen* for the Tibetan *bcom ldan 'das* (buddha), *gêlong* instead of *ayaγ-q-a tegimlig* for the Tibetan *dge slong* (monk), *dayin-i darun* instead of *dayini daruγsan* for the Tibetan *dgra bcom pa* (arhat), *batu oron*① for the Tibetan *gnas brtan* (elder), etc.

The syntactic and stylistic peculiarities of this translation also reveal *Zaya paṇḍita*'s authorship. Researchers have repeatedly described him as a translator who preferred to render the Tibetan text word by word, copying the grammatical structures and word order.② The following scheme shows a typical example of his translating technique:

	Tibetan (Peking Kanjur, Vol. 46,[1] ff. 288r–v)	Mong.Q1, f. 364v
1	rigs kyi bu	iǰayur-un köbegün-e
2	sems can de dag ni	amitan tede inu
3	de ltar chos la gus par byed cing	tere metü nom–tür süsül–ün üiledüged
4	chos rnams la rten pa dang/	nom–nuγud–a sitügsen kiged
5	dad pa dang ldan pas	bisirel–lüge tegüsügsen–iyer
6	dad pa dang dang ba skyed pas	bisirel kiged süsüg egüskeküi–ber
7	byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po	bodi satu–a maha–a satu–a
8	chos 'phags kyi drung du	nom–un qutuγ–un dergede
9	shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa nyan to/	bilig baramid–i sonosumui:

1. Here and onward the Tibetan Beijing (Peking) Kanjur edition of 1700 (abbr. Tib.Peking) is used as an example of the Tibetan text of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (the *phreng ba can* version).

① Other Mongolian translators render this term in different ways, such as *batuda ayči, ʾayali batu, čing oron* or *aqui sitügen*, but *batu oron* is specific to *Zaya paṇḍita*. For more information on the differences in vocabulary between eight Mongolian translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* see: Yampolskaya, *Jadamba*, pp. 95–119.

② See for example: A. D. Tsendina, "*Dva mongol'skikh perevoda tibetskogo sochineniya 'Kniga syna' *" // Mongolica V (Sankt-Peterburg, 2001), pp. 54–74; N. S. Yakhontova, "*Vliyanie tibetskogo yazyka na sintaksis oiratskikh perevodov* // Mongolica Pamyati Borisa Yakovlevicha Vladimirtsova (1884–1931) (Moskva, 1986), pp. 113–117.

The translator allows only the slightest changes in the wording of the sentence: he adds the Vocative case marker (*-e*) which is not used in Tibetan (line 1), and uses the Accusative (*-i*) to mark the object (line 9). In this example, as well as throughout the whole text, the Tibetan auxiliary verb *byed* (to do) is often rendered with the help of the Mongolian verb *üiledkü* of the same meaning (line 3), although this verb does not have the same function in the Mongolian language. This translation pattern has been described as typical for the works of *Zaya paṇḍita*.[①]

In general the Mongolian translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* by *Zaya paṇḍita* can be characterised by the following features: the Tibetan word order is almost never altered, the elements of original grammar (case endings, etc.) are left unchanged regardless of their functions in the grammar of the target language, terms and expressions are mechanically translated with fixed equivalents that do not change depending on the context. Altogether, this degree of devotion to the original text produces a Mongolian translation that is difficult to comprehend without addressing the Tibetan source, or at least having a command of the Tibetan language.

The Mongolian and Oirat Translations Compared

I have not performed a full collation of the two texts, but an analysis of selected fragments from different chapters of the sutra in search of reccuring patterns that would indicate to their kinship. My observations are summarised below. An Appendix is introduced at the end of the article in order to illustrate the commentaries with extensive text material, as well as to allow the reader to from an independent opinion. It is a comparative table that contains the text of Chapter 32 of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajāpāramitā* in Tibetan and the two translations by *Zaya paṇḍita* (the lines of the table are numbered to facilitate reference).[②]

The differences between the two translations vary in character: they include dialect differences, minor dissimilarities in content (missing words, etc.), and intentional improvements. The basic differences in grammar and vocabulary between Mongolian and Oirat will not be commented upon, as they would present themselves in both a re-write and a new translation. Below are several examples of clichés systematically used in the two translations to render the same Tibetan expressions:

---

① The use of *üiledkü* to render the Tibetan *byed* is not exclusive to the works of *Zaya paṇḍita*, but is one of the distinct features of his style. See: A. D. Tsendina, *"Dva mongol'skikh perevoda tibetskogo sochineniya 'Kniga syna' "*, p. 58; N. S. Yakhontova, *"Vliyanie tibetskogo yazyka na sintaksis oiratskikh perevodov"*, p. 114.

② I have used Chpater 32 to illustrate comparative translation studies before, as it is short enough to be included in publications. The text of this chapter in eight different Mongolian translations can be found in: Natalia Yampolskaya, *Jadamba*, pp. 245–269.

Tibetan	Mongolian	Oirat
bcom ldan 'das	ilaγ-un tegüs ülegsen burqan¹	ilaγun tögüsün üleqsen
yang dag par rdzogs pa	üneger tuγuluγsan	sayitur dousuqsan
tshe dang ldan pa	nasu tegülder	nasu tögüs
shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa	bilig baramid	biligiyin činadu kürüqsen
dri za	gandari	ünür ideqči
rgyal mtshan	dhuvaja	ilaγuqsan belget
rig par bya'o	uqaγdaqui	uxan üyiled
bka' stsal pa	Jarliγ bolor-un	zarliq bolboi
dper na	adalidqabasu	üligerkülē

1. In the Mongolian text the word *burqan* (buddha) is usually added to the term *ilaγ-un tegüs ülegsen* (translation of the Tibetan *bcom ldan 'das*, renders the Sanskrit *bhagavan* — "blessed" , a honorific used to address the Buddha) to specify that it refers to the Buddha, although the word "buddha" is absent from the Tibetan text.

There are passages in the text that are free from any other differences than these systematic ones, but these are usually simple short sentences that consist of clichés (see Appendix, lines 17–20, 24, 25, 30–32). It is likely that the same translator would render these standard passages, very common for a canonical sutra, in the same way even when translating the text anew.

Minor differences in content occur infrequently and are limited to occasional missing words or rearrangement of sequences in lists. Here is an example from Chapter 1 of the sutra where the qualities of the Buddha's listeners are listed (all of them arhats, free of contaminations, free of afflictions, empowered). In the Oirat translation the term "arhat (*dayini daruqsan*)" is repositioned in the list:

Tib.Peking [1]: thams cad kyang **dgra bcom pa**/ zag pa zad pa/ nyon mongs pa med pa/ dbang du gyur pa

Mong.Q1 [2r]: tedeger ču **dayin-i darun**: čuburil baraγsan: nisvanis ügei: erket boluγsan:

Oir.Xyl. [2r]: xamuq cu cuburil baran nisvanis ügei erkešil üyiledüqsen **dayini daruqsan:**

Differences like this emerge from technicalities: the translator (or editor) could use a different Tibetan text, or the scribes could make a mistake while copying. Unless proven otherwise, cases like this cannot be considered to be the result of intentional editing. ①

It is important to distinguish between the changes introduced by *Zaya paṇḍita* himself and the results of later copying mistakes and editing. A deceptive example can be found in the beginning

---

① Likewise, in line 2 of the Appendix in the Oirat version the list of cardinal directions is confused: the East is listed twice, first as *urγuxui züq*, then as *zöün züq*. This mistake occurs in both the blockprint and the manuscript, but the source of it is not known.

of Chapter 32, in the phrase *bodhisattva-mahāsattva Sadāprarūdita* obtained six million doors of *samādhi* (see Appendix, line 1). In the Oirat manuscript the word "doors" (Oir. *öüde*) is used, while in the blockprint it is replaced with "items" or "categories" (Oir. *züyil*). It is not clear which of the two versions is closer to the original text created by *Zaya paṇḍita*, and which is a later change.

The same phrase reveals an essentially different kind of variance — a change in word order that helps to avoid a mistake. As a result of following the Tibetan word order a mistake occurred in the Mongolian translation: the number six million (Tib. *brgya stong phrag drug cu*, i. e. "one hundred thousand times sixty") turned into one hundred thousand and sixty (Mong. *ǰaγun mingγan ǰiran*). In the Oirat version the word order is changed in such a way that the phrase retains its closeness to the original, but the meaning is not distorted: *ǰiran mingγan zoun*, i. e. "sixty thousand hundred", which equals six million. This is just one of the many examples in which the Oirat translation demonstrates a cardinally different approach to rendering the source text: it reproduces the Tibetan text as closely as possible, but does not interfere with the principles of the target language grammar. The most oft-repeated pattern is shifting noun modifiers from post-position in Tibetan to pre-position in Oirat (see Appendix, lines 3, 9).

The Mongolian translation by *Zaya paṇḍita* contains semantic errors rooted in the inflexibility of its vocabulary: Tibetan terms and expressions are rendered with fixed equivalents that do not change, regardless of the context. In the Oirat translation this mechanical approach is avoided. Let us consider two examples from Chapter 1 of the sutra. In the course of a dialogue between the Buddha's disciples on the subject of emptiness (*śūnyatā*), *Śāriputra* asks *Subhūti* the following question: "But a thought which is no thought — does that thought exist?" In his Mongolian translation *Zaya paṇḍita* meticulously reproduced every single element of the Tibetan sentence, but mistook the noun "thought" (Tib. *sems*) in its first occurrence for the verb "think", which he attached to the words *yang ci* (*yang* — but, moreover; *ci* — interrogative pronoun). This influenced the structure and meaning of the sentence:

Tib.Peking [3r]: yang ci sems gang sems med pa'i sems de yod dam

Mong.Q1 [5r]: basa yaγun sedkimüi ali sedkil ügei-yin sedkil tere bui buyu: ("And what do you think, a thought of no thought — does it exhist?")

In the Oirat translation the sentence is less faithful to the original in form: some words are left out (*sems* in its first occurrence, the Genetive case marker *'i*), the pronoun *tere* (that) is placed before the noun *sedkil* (thought). As a result it renders the meaning more clearly:

Oir.Xyl. [4r]: ali youn[①] sedkil ügei tere sedkil bui buyu: (Some non-thought — does that

---

①   Oir.Ms. [4r]: ali yerü.

thought exist?)

Later in the text *Subhūti* urges *Śāriputra* to rethink his question asking: "A thought which is no thought — does that thought exist?" — is this argument of yours appropriate?. Once again the Mongolian translation follows Tibetan word by word, placing the pronouns *ali* and *tere* after the noun *sedkil*, which makes the sentence incomprehensible without a reference to Tibetan.

Tib.Peking [3v]: sems gang sems med pa'i sems de yod dam zhes smras pa'i khyod kyi brgal ba gang yin pa de ci rigs par 'gyur ram/

Mong.Q1 [5r–v]: sedkil ali sedkil ügei-yin sedkil tere bui buyu: kemen ügüleküi činu getülügsen ali mön tere yaɣu basa bolqu buyu:

The Tibetan word *brgal ba* (objection, argument) is erroneously rendered as *getülügsen*, a form of the verb *getülkü* (cross, go beyond). The word *brgal ba* is ambiguous, it can be interpreted as a form of two different verbs: *rgal ba* (cross, go beyond) or *rgol ba* (object, disagree). Despite the clear context of the sentence the translator selected the wrong option, which characterises his choice as mechanical, with little attention paid to the meaning of the phrase. In the Oirat version this word is rendered correctly as *temeceküi* (argument, ccompetition). Just as in the previous example, the sentence does not reproduce every single word of the source language, which makes it shorter and more coherent:

Oir.Xyl. [4r]: sedkil ali sedkil ügei tere sedkil bui buyu: kemēn ögüüleqsen čini temeceküi aliba tere bolxu buyu:[①]

The instances described above represent a principal difference in the translation techniques used in the Mongolian and Oirat texts. The Oirat translation remains close to the original in form, but tends to deviate from its exact wording when the target language calls for it: sentences retain their general structure, but words and phrases can be re-positioned (the most common example is shifting noun modifiers from post- to pre-position); certain words can be left out. These meaningful changes could only be introduced to the text by *Zaya paṇḍita*, not by the later editors. But do they suggest that the old translation was simply re-written, or a new one was created independently?

The abovementioned tendencies manifest themselves throughout the text, but are not followed consistently. Moreover, there are examples of the opposite. See Appendix, line 5: in the Mongolian

---

① Oir.Ms. [4r]: sedkil <ali> ügei tere sedkil bui buyu: kemēn ögüüleqsen čini temecekü tere bolxu buyu. In this case the Oirat blockprint and manuscript differ in several ways. The text of the blockprint follows Tibetan more closely (the word *sedkil* Tib. *sems*) is repeated thrice, the words *aliba tere* are used to render the Tibetan *gang yin pa de* ("that which is", a phrase that defines the word "argument"). In the manuscript the word *sedkil* occurs only twice, and the word *aliba* is omitted. It is problematic to comment on the nature of these differences, as it is not known which version is closer to the original.

translation the pronouns assume their natural position before the nouns (*ene yosun, ene neres*), while in ther Oirat text they are put in post-position (*yosu ene, nere ene*), following the Tibetan model (*tshul 'di, ming , 'di*). A similar pattern can be found in line 33, the name and number of the chapter (the thirty second chapter called "Entrustment"): in the Mongolian version the number precedes the word "chapter"(*yučin qoyaduyar bölög*), while in the Oirat text the Tibetan word order is reproduced (*bölöq inu yučin xoyoduyār bui*). These instances contradict the general tendency to "mongolise" the word order, and suggest that *Zaya paṇḍita* translated the text anew, without reference to his earlier Mongolian translation.

Conclusions

The arguments considered above, combined with the extra-textual data, suggest that the Oirat text is not an improved version of the Mongolian one, but a new, independently created translation:

1. The Mongolian text had a different colophon, and the Oirat colophon describes the act of translation without references to an older one.

2. The differences between the Mongolian and Oirat texts reveal the tendency to improve the quality of translation (correct mistakes, etc.), but that is not always the case. An improved adaptation of an older translation would aim at perfecting the text at all times.

3. The similarities between the two texts can be explained by the strictness and predictability of the sutra narrative that does not allow for variety, as well as by the fact that they were translated by the same person.

A comparison of the two texts demonstrates the evolution of *Zaya paṇḍita*'s translation skills. While the earlier translation is but a verbatim reproduction of the Tibetan text with the help of Mongolian words, the Oirat one reveals a mature, thoughtful approach to rendering the scripture in one's native language. It is manifested in both the preference for translated terms over foreign words, and the adjustment of syntactic structures to the principles of Oirat grammar.

Appendix. Chapter 32 of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajāpāramitā*

	Tibetan, Peking Kanjur, Vol. 46	Mongolian, Ms. Q1	Oirat blockprint, 1742
1	[310r] rab 'byor byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rtag tu ngus [310v] ting nge 'dzin gyi sgo brgya stong phrag drug cu thob ma thag tu/	[385v] subuti–a nasuda uyilaqai bodi satu–a maha–a satu–a diyan–u egüdes Jayun mingyan Jiran toyatan–i oluyad saca	[377v] subuti nasuda uyilaqči bodhi sadwᵃ mahā sadwᵃ: Jiran mingyan zoun diyāni züyiliˡ olōd saca:

Appendix. Chapter 32 of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajāpāramitā* (*Continued*)

	Tibetan, Peking Kanjur, Vol. 46	Mongolian, Ms. Q1	Oirat blockprint, 1742
2	shar phyogs dang lho phyogs dang nub phyogs dang byang phyogs dang mtshams dang 'og dang steng gi phyogs dang phyogs bcu'i 'jig rten stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams gang gA'i klung gi bye ma snyed dag na/	uryuqui ĵüg kiged emüne ĵüg ba ürün-e <ĵüg> kiged umara ĵüg ba ĵobkis kiged door-a ba deger-e ĵüg kiged: arban ĵüg-ün yirtinčü yurban mingyan yeke mingyan yirtinčü-yin oron <gangga mören-ü qumaki-yin tedüi-nuyud-a:	uryuxui züq kigēd baroun züq: šinggeküi züq kigēd zöün züq: zügiyin zabsar kigēd dorodutai dēdü züq: arban zügiyin yertüncü yurban mingyani yeke mingyan yangya müreni xumakiyin tōtoi yertüncüyin oron-du:
3	sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das gang gA'i klung gi bye ma snyed dag dge slong gi dge 'dun gyis yongs su bskor cing byang chub sems dpa'i tshogs kyis mdun du byas te tshul 'di lta bu nyid dang ming 'di nyid dang yi ge 'di nyid kyis shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di 'chad pa mthong ngo//	ilayun tegüs ülegsen burqan> gangga mören-ü qumaki-yin tedüi (kalab) <gelong>-un quvaray-ud-iyar oyoyata küriyelegül-ün bodi-satu-a-yin čiyulyan-iyar emüne-ben bayiyulĵu yosun ene metü činar kiged ner-e ene činar ba üsüg ene činar-iyar bilig baramid egün-i nomlaqui üĵebei::	yangya müreni xumakiyin tōtoi ilayun tögüsüqsen burxan-noyoud: gelüng-giyin xuvaraq oyōto kürēlen: bodhi sadw^a-yin cuulyan emüne orošin: yosu ene metü kigēd nere ene kigēd üzüq öügēr biligiyin činadu kürüqsen öüni nomloxui üzebei:
4	'di lta ste dper na da ltar nga stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams 'di na chos ston pa dge slong gi dge 'dun gyis yongs su bskor cing	ene metü <amu> üligerlebesü edüge bi yurban mingyan yeke mingyan yirtinčü-yin oron egün-e nom üĵügülküi gelong-ün quvaray-ud-iyar oyoyata küriyegül-ün	ene metü üligerleküle ödüge yurban mingyani yeke mingyan yertüncüyin oron ende bi: nom üzüülüqči² gelünggiyin xuvaraq oyōto kürēlen:
5	byang chub sems dpa'i tshogs kyis mdun du byas te tshul 'di nyid dang ming 'di nyid dang yi ge 'di nyid kyis shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di 'chad pa bzhin no//	bodi-satu-a-yin čiyulyan-iyar emüne bayiyulĵu: mön ene yosun kiged <mön> ene neres ba üsüg ene činar-iyar bilig baramid egün-i nomlaqui metü amu:	bodhi sadw^a-yin cuulyan emüne orošiĵi: yosu ene kigēd nere ene: üzüq ödüi činēn-yēr biligiyin činadu kürüqsen öüni nomloxu metü bui:³
6	de mang du thos pa bsam gyis mi khyab pa dang thos pa rgya mtsho dang ldan par gyur te/	tere olan-a sonosuysan sedkisi ügei kiged sonosuysan dalai-luy-a tegüs boluyad:	tere olo sonosuqsan sedkiši ügei kigēd: sonosuqsan dalai metü-lüge tögüsün üyiledĵi:
7	gar skyes pa thams cad du yang nam yang sangs rgyas dang bral bar ma gyur to//	qamiy-a töröküi bükün-e ber keĵiy-e čü burqan-ača qayačal ügei [386r] bolbai::	xamiyā töröqsön xamuq-tu cu kezē cü burxan-ēce xayacal ügei:
8	skye ba thams cad du yang gang dang gang du sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rnams mngon sum du 'gyur ba de dang de dag tu skyes te tha na rmi lam na yang sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das dag dang mi 'bral bar 'gyur ro//	qamuy <töröl>-tür aliba alin-a ilay-un tegüs ülegsen burqan-nuyud iled boluysan ĵara kiged teden-e töröĵu: yadabaču ĵegüdün-e ču ilay-un tegüs ülegsen burqan-nuyud-ača ülü qayačaqu bolbai::	xamuq töröl töröl-dü cü xamiyā xamiyā-du: ilayun tögüsüqsen burxan-noyoud ilerkei boluqsan tede teden-dü törön: yadaba zöüdün-dü cü ilayun tögüsüqsen burxan-ēce ülü xayacaxu boluyu:
9	des mi khom pa thams cad ni spangs dal ba phun sum tshogs pa ni bsgrubs so//	tere qamuy čöle ügei-yi tebčin čöle qotala tegüsügsen-i bütügebei::	[378r] töün-yēr colo⁴ ügei xamugi tebčin: xotolo tögüsüqsen coloi bütēbei:
10	de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo la bka' stsal pa/	tendeče ilay-un tegüs ülegsen burqan nasu tegülder ananda-tur ĵarliy bolur-un:	tende ilayun tögüsün üleqsen nasu tögüs ānanda-du zarliq bolboi:

Appendix. Chapter 32 of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajāpāramitā* (*Continued*)

	Tibetan, Peking Kanjur, Vol. 46	Mongolian, Ms. Q1	Oirat blockprint, 1742
11	kun dga' bo rnam grangs 'dis kyang shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rnams kyi thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes sgrub pa yin par rig par bya'o//	ananda-a düri toγ-a egün-iyer bilig baramid ene bodi satu-a mah-a satu-a-nuγud-un qamuγ-yi medegči-yin belge bilig-yi bütügegči mön kemen uqaγdaqui::	ānanda züyil öügēr cü: biligiyin činadu kürüqsen öüni: bodhi sadw^a mahā sadw^a-noγoudiyin xamugi medeqčiyin belge biliq bütēkü mün-dü uxan üyiled:[5]
12	kun dga' bo de lta bas na byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes [311r] thob par 'dod pa dag gis shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di la spyad par bya'o//	ananda-a teyimü-yin tula bodi satu-a mah-a satu-a qamuγ-yi medegči-yin belge bilig-yi olqui küsegčin-nuγud bilig baramid egün-e edlegdeküi::	ānanda tere metü-yin tula bodhi sadw^a mahā sadw^a: xamugi medeqči belge biliq olxui küseqčin: biligiyin činadu kürüqsen öüni edlen üyiledkü::
13	shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di mnyan par bya gzung bar bya bcang par bya klag par bya kun chub par bya rab tu 'don par bya bstan par bya nye bar bstan par bya	bilig baramid egün-i sonosun üiledüged toγtaγan qadalan. negen. bükün-i oruγulun. sayitur ungsin üiled. üjügül-ün sayitur üjügül-ün üiled.	biligiyin činadu kürüqsen öüni sonosun üyiledün barin üyiledün: xadaγlan üyiledkü nēn üyiledün büküni oroulun üyiledün[6] sayitur ungšin üyiledkü: üzüülün üyiledkü sayitur üzüülün üyiledkü:
14	lung 'bogs par bya kha ton tu bya bri bar bya de bzhin gshegs pa'i byin gyi rlabs kyis glegs bam chen po la yi ge gsal zhing rab tu gsal ba legs par bris te	esi öggün amabar ungsin bičin üiled: tegünčilen iregsen-ü adistid-iyar yeke debter-tür üsüg todorqai büged masi todorqai sayitur bičijü:	eši ögün üyiledün amabēr ungšin üyiled bičin üyiledün: tögünčilen boluqsani adistid-yēr: yeke debter-tü bičiq todorxoi üzüq maši todorxoi sayitur bičiji:[7]
15	me tog dang bdug pa dang dri dang phreng ba dang byug pa dang phye ma dang na bza' dang gdugs dang rgyal mtshan dang dril bu dang ba dan dang kho rakhor yug tu mar me'i phreng ba dang mchod pa rnam pa mang pos	čečeg kiged küji ba ünüd. erikes. sürčiküi. kemkedeg. čenggelge kiged. qubčad ba. sikür dhuvaca. qongqos badan-nuγud ba orčin bükün-e julas-un erikes kiged: olan jüil takil-nuγud-iyar	ceceq kigēd utulγa: ünür kigēd eriken: sürčilge kigēd kemkedeq: cenggelge kigēd xubcasun: kükür kigēd ilaγuqsan belgetü: xongxo kigēd badan: orčin tōrin-du zulayin eriken: olon züyil takil-yēr
16	bkur stir bya bla mar bya rjed par bya mchod par bya ri mor bya bsnyen bkur bya ste kun dga' bo 'di na nga'i rjes su bstan pa'o//	ergün kündülen <degedü bolγan kündülen takiju jiruγlan čiqula kündülel> üiledeküi:: ananda-a egün-i bi daγan üjügülügsen amu:	sayin kündülel üyiledün: dēdü-dü üyiledün erken-dü üyiledün: takin üyiledün zuruqtu üyiledün cuxula kündülel üyiledkü: ānanda ene inu mini daxan üzüülüqsen bui:[8]
17	de ci'i phyir zhe na/ shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di las thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes yongs su rdzogs par 'gyur ro/	tere yaγun-u tula kemebesü: bilig baramid egün-eče qamuγ-yi medegči-yin belge bilig oγoyata tegüskü boluyu::	tere youni tula kemebēsü: biligiyin činadu kürüqsen öün-ēce xamugi medeqčiyin belge biliq oγōto tögöskü boluyu:
18	kun dga' bo 'di ji snyam du sems de bzhin gshegs pa khyod kyi ston pa yin nam/	ananda-a egün-i yaγun kemen sedkimü: tegünčilen [386v] iregsen činu baγsi mön buyu:	ānanda öün-dü you sedkikü: tögünčilen boluqsan čini baqši mün buyu:
19	kun dga' bos gsol pa/ bcom ldan 'das bdag gi ston pa lags so bde bar gshegs pa bdag gi ston pa lags so//	ananda ayilidqabai: ilaγ-un tegüs ülegsen minu baγsi bui: sayibar oduγsan minu baγsi bolui:	ānanda [378v] ayiladxabai: ilaγun tögüsüqsen mini baqši mün: sayibar oduqsan mini baqši mün:

Appendix. Chapter 32 of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajāpāramitā* (*Continued*)

	Tibetan, Peking Kanjur, Vol. 46	Mongolian, Ms. Q1	Oirat blockprint, 1742
20	de skad ces gsol pa dang bcom ldan 'das kyis tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to//	teyin kemen ayilidqaγsan-tur: ilaγ-un tegüs ülegsen burqan nasu tegülder ananda-tur eyin kemen ǰarliγ bolur-un:	teyin kemēn ayiladxaqsan-du: ilaγun tögüsün ülüqsen nasu tögüs ānanda-du eyin kemēn zarliq bolboi:
21	kun dga' bo khyod kyi ston pa de bzhin gshegs pa la kun dga' bo khyod kyis lus kyi las byams pa yid du 'ong ba dang ngag gi las byams pa yid du 'ong ba dang yid kyi las byams pa yid du 'ong bas rim gror byas te	ananda-a činu baγsi tegünčilen iregsen-e ananda či bey-e-yin üiles asaraqui sedkil-e oroqui kiged: kelen-ü üiles asaraqui sedkil-e oroqui ba sedkil-ün üiles asaraqui sedkil-e oroqui-bar kündülel üiledeküi:	ānanda čini baqši tögünčilen boluqsan-du: ānanda či beyeyin üyile sedkil-dü tālaxui asaraxu kigēd: keleni üyile sedkil-dü tālaxu asaraxui: sedkili-yin üyile sedkil-dü tālaxu asaraxui-bēr tusalan kündülen kündülemüi:[9]
22	de lta bas na kun dga' bo da ltar nga bzhugs te 'tsho zhing gzhes pa'i sku 'di la ci ltar khyod kyis dga' ba dang dad pa dang dad pa dang ri mor byas pa kun dga' bo de ltar nga 'das nas shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di la yang byos shig/	tere metü-yin tula ananda-a: edüge bi saγuǰu tedkün taγalaqui bey-e egün-e yamaru metü či bayasqui kiged bisireküi ba ǰiruγlan üiledügsen tere metü ananda-a bi nögčibesü bilig baramid egün-e ber bisilγaγdaqui:	tere metüyin tula ānanda ödügē bi soun an (?) tālaqči beye öün-dü yamāru či tālan sücülün zürüqtü üyiledkü: ānanda tere metü namai nöqčiqsön xoino biligiyin činadu kürüqsen öün-dü cü üyiled
23	kun dga' bo ci nas shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di nub par mi 'gyur zhing ci nas khyod [311b] skyes bu tha mar mi 'gyur bar kun dga' bo khyod la lan gnyis lan gsum du yongs su gtad do rjes su yongs su gtad do/	ananda-a yakibasu. bilig baramid ene bi singekü ülü boluγad yakibasu či törölkiten-ü adaγ ülü bolqui ananda-a čimadur qoyar γurban-ta oγoγata qatangγuqamui: daγan oγoγata qatangγuqamui::	ānanda biligiyin činadu kürüqsen ene maγad ülü ecüdün:[10] maγad či ecüs törölkitü ülü bolxuya: ānanda čimadu xoyor-to γurban-ta oγōto xadangγadxan öqböyi: xoyišido oγōto xadangγadxan öqböyi:
24	kun dga' bo shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di 'jig rten na ci srid du rab tu spyod pa de srid du de bzhin gshegs pa bzhugs par rig par bya'o//	ananda-a bilig baramid egün-i yirtinčü-de keǰiy-e ču sayitur edleküi teǰiy-e-de tegünčilen iregsed saγuqu kemen uqaγdaqui::	ānanda biligiyin činadu kürüqsen öüni yertüncü-dü keǰiyē sayitur edlekü teǰiyēde: tögünčilen boluqsan souqsan-du uxan üyiledkü:
25	kun dga' bo de srid du de bzhin gshegs pa chos ston par rig par bya'o/	ananda-a teǰiy-e-de tegünčilen iregsen nom üǰügülkü kemen uqaγdaqui::	ānanda teǰiyēde tögünčilen boluqsan nom üzüülküi-dü[11] uxan üyiled:
26	kun dga' bo gang shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di nyan pa dang 'dzin pa dang 'chang ba dang klog pa dang kun chub par byed pa dang/ rab tu 'don pa dang ston pa dang nye bar ston pa dang lung 'bogs pa dang kha ston byed pa dang yi ger 'dri ba dang/	ananda ken bilig baramid egün-i sonosuγčin kiged bariγčin ba qataγalaγčin kiged negegčin büküni-i oroγul-un üiledügčin. sayitur ungsiγčin kiged: üǰügülügčin sayitur üǰügülügčin: esi öggügčin amabar ungsin üiledügčin ba: üsüg-e bičigčin kiged	ānanda ali biligiyin činadu kürüqsen öüni sonosuqči kigēd bariqči kigēd xadaγalaqči nēqči kigēd büküni oroulun üyiledüqči kigēd sayitur ungsiqči: üzüülüqči sayitur üzüülüqči: eši ögüqči kigēd ama-bēr ungšin üyiledüqči: bičiqtü bičikü kigēd
27	me tog dang bdug pa dang dri dang phreng ba dang byug pa dang phye ma dang na bza' dang gdugs dang rgyal mtshan dang dril bu dang ba dan dag dang khor yug du mar me'i phreng ba dang mchod pa rnam pa mang po dag gis/	čečeg ba: küǰi kiged ünüd ba erikes [387r] sürčiküi kemkedeg ‹čuγlaγur› qubčad sikür dhuvaca qongqos badan-nuγud ba: orčin bükün-e ǰulas-un erikes kiged: olan ǰüil takil-nuγud-iyar	ceceq: utulγa kigēd ünür: eriken kigēd sürčilge: kemkedeq kigēd xubcasun: kükür kigēd ilaγuqsan belgetü: [379r] xongxo kigēd badan: orčin tōrin-du zulayin eriken kigēd: olon züyil takil-noγoud-yēr

Appendix. Chapter 32 of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajāpāramitā* (*Continued*)

	Tibetan, Peking Kanjur, Vol. 46	Mongolian, Ms. Q1	Oirat blockprint, 1742
28	bkur stir byed bla mar byed rjed par byed mchod par byed ri mor byed bsnyen bkur byed pa'i sems can de dag ni sangs rgyas mthong ba dang dam pa'i chos nyan pa dang dge 'dun la rim gro byed pa dang ma bral bar rig par bya'o//	ergün kündülen degedü bolγan: kündülen takiJu: Jiruγlan čiqula. kündülel üiledügči amitan teden inu: burqan-i üJekü kiged: degedü nom-i sonosqui ba: quvaraγ-tur kündülel üiledküi-eče ülü qaγačaqu kemen uqaγdaqui::	sayitur kündülel üiledün dēdü-dü üiledün: erkin-dü üiledün takin üiledüqči: zürüqtu üiledün cuxula kündülel üiledüqči amitan tede inu: burxan üzekü kigēd dēdü nom sonosxu: xuvaraq-tu kündülül üiledküi-ēce xaγacaxu ügei-dü uxan üiledkü:[12]
29	kun dga' bo sems can de dag ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i drung na spyod par rig par bya'o//	ananda-a amitan tede inu: tegünčilen iregsen-ü dergede yabuqu kemen uqaγdaqui::	ānanda amitan tedeni tögünčilen boluqsani kigēd-dü edleqsendü uxan üiledkü::
30	bcom ldan 'das dgyes shing de skad ces bka' stsal pa dang/	ilaγ-un tegüs ülegsen burqan bayas-un teyin (···) Jarliγ boluγsan-tur:	ilayun tögüsün üleqsen bayasun teyin kemēn zarliq boluqsan-du:
31	byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po byams pa la sogs pa dang tshe dang ldan pa rab 'byor dang tshe dang ldan pa shA ri'i bu dang tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo dang	mayidari bodi satu-a mah-a satu-a terigüten kiged: nasu tegülder subuti ba: nasu tegülder šari-yin köbegün kiged: nasu tegülder ananda ba:	bodhi sadwᵃ mahā sadwᵃ mayidari terigüten kigēd: nasu tögüs subudi kigēd nasu tögüs šariyin kübüün: nasu tögüs ānanda-tai:
32	lha rnams kyi dbang po brgya byin dang lha dang mi dang lha ma yin dang dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig rten yi rangs te/ bcom ldan 'das kyis gsungs pa la mngon par bstod do//	tngris-ün erketü qormusta kiged tngri kümün ba: asuri kiged: gandari selte yirtinčüs bayasulčaJu: ilaγ-un tegüs ülegsen burqan-u Jarliγ-yi ilede maγtabai::	tenggeri-noγoudiyin erketü xurmusta kigēd: tenggeri kümün kigēd asuri-tai: ünür ideqči selte yertüncüner daxan bayasči: ilayun tögüsün üleqseni zarligi ilerkei maqtabai::
33	'phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa brgyad stong pa las yongs su gtad pa'i le'u zhes bya ste sum cu rtsa gnyis pa'o//	qutuγ-tu bilig-ün činadu kürügsen naiman mingγan-tu-ača: oγoγata qatangγadququi neretü γučin qoyaduγar bölög:: : ::	xutuq-tu biligiyin činadu kürüqsen nayiman mingγa-tu-ēce oγōto xadangγadxan ögüqsen kemēküi bölöq inu γučin xoyoduγār bui:: : ::

1. Oir.Ms. [377v]: diyāni Jiran mingγan zoun öüde

2. Oir.Ms. [377v]: üzüülkü

3. Oir.Ms. [377v]: bodhi sadwᵃ-yin cuulγan emüne orošiJi: yosu ene metü kigēd: yosu ene kigēd nere ene: ene üzüq-yēr biligiyin činadu kürüqsen öüni nomloxu metü:

4. Oir.Ms. [378r]: tere colo

5. Oir.Ms. [378r]: bodhi sadwᵃ mahā sadwᵃ-noγoud xamugi medeqčiyin belge biliq bütēqsen mün-dü uxan üiled:

6. Oir.Ms. [378r]: biligiyin činadu kürüqsen öüni sonosun üyiled barin üyiled: xadaγlan üyiledkü nēn üyiled: büküni oroulun üyiled

7. Oir.Ms. [378r]: eši ögün üyiled ama-bēr ungšin üyiled bičin üyiled: tögünčilen boluqsani adistid-yēr: yeke debtertü bičiq todorxoi: maši todorxoi sayitur bičiJi:

8. Oir.Ms. [378r]: ānanda öüni inu bi daxan üzüülbei:

9. Oir.Ms. [378v]: ānanda čini baqši tögünčilen boluqsan-du: ānanda či beyeyin üyile sedkil-dü oroxui asaraxui kigēd: keleni üyile sedkil-dü oroxui asaraxui: sedkiliyin üyile sedkil-dü oroxui asaraxui-bēr tusalan kündülemüi:

10. Oir.Ms. [378v]: ānanda biligiyin činadu kürüqsen ene ülü ecüdün:

11. Oir.Ms. [378v]: üzüülküi

12. Oir.Ms. [379r]: xuvaraq–tu tusalaxui üyiledün xayacaxu ügei–dü uxan üyiledkü:

Special Signs

(...)   text torn out or erased

< >   text written in as correction

Additional signs in Mongolian/Oirat

ĉ ᄇ   j ᄴ   ź ᄴ   đ ᄀ   ḍ ᄀ   ṇ ᄀ   p ᄡ

ž ᄋ   ' ᄀ   ê ᄀ   ô ᄀ   yᵃ ᄀ   wᵃ ᄀ

Bibliography

G. Gerelmaa. Brief Catalogue of Oirat Manuscripts kept by Institute of Language and Literature, Vol. Ⅲ. (Ulaanbaatar, 2005).

Heissig, Walther. Die Pekinger lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache: Materialien zur mongolischen Literaturgeschichte (Wiesbaden, 1954).

Ili-yin γool-un urusqal daγau oron-du qataγalaγdaǰu bayiγ-a todo üsüg-ün surbulǰi bičig-ün čiγulγan, 1 (öbör mongγool-un keblel-ün bölüglel, öbör mongγol-un soyol-un keblel-ün quriy-a, 2015).

Ili-yin γool-un urusqal daγau oron-du qataγalaγdaǰu bayiγ-a todo üsüg-ün surbulǰi bičig-ün čiγulγan 5 (tabuduγar boti) (öbör mongγool-un keblel-ün bölüglel, öbör mongγol-un soyol-un keblel-ün quriy-a, 2016).

Istoriya Choidzhid-dagini. Faksimile rukopisi / Transliteratsiya teksta, perevod s mongol'sko-go, issledovanie i kommmentariy A. G. Sazykina. Otv. red. S. Y. Neklyudov (Moskva, 1990).

Kara, György. Books of the Mongolian Nomads: More Than Eight Centuries of Writing Mongolian, trans. John G. Krueger, Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series 171 (Bloomington, 2005).

Radnabhadra, "Lunniy svet": istoriya rabdzham Dzaya-pandity. Faksimile rukopisi; perevod s oyratskogo G. N. Rumyantseva i A. G. Sazykina; transliteratsiya teksta, predisloviye, primechaniya i ukazateli A. G. Sazykina (Sankt-Peterburg, 1999).

Sazykin, A. G. "O periodizatsii perevodcheskoi deyatel'nosti oiratskogo Dzaya-pandity" // Pis'mennnye pamyatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. ⅩⅡ. godichnaya nauchnaya sessiya LO IV AN SSSR (kratkie sooobscheniya). Chast' 1 (Moskva, 1977). pp. 134–140.

Sazykin, Aleksei G. and György Kara, "A Fifth, Anonymous, Mongolian Translation of the 'Diamond Sutra'" // Mongolian Studies, Vol. 22 (1999). pp. 69–99.

Sazykin, A. G. Katalog mongol'skikh rukopisey i ksilografov Instituta vostokovedeniya Rossiyskoy Akademii nauk. Tom Ⅱ (Moskva, 2001).

Torricelli, Fabrizio. "Un Libro Sacro Tibetano Nella Collezione De Filippi al Museo Nazionale d'Antropologia e Etnologia Di Firenze" // Archivo per l'Antropologia e La Etnologia CXXIX (1999). pp. 273–285.

Torricelli, Fabrizio, and Nikolai N. Dudka. "Manuscript LTWA No. 23476. A 'SDe Can' Sample of the BrGyad Stong Pa" // Tibet Journal, No. 24 (2) (1999). pp. 29–44.

Tsendina, A. D. "Dva mongol'skikh perevoda tibetskogo sochineniya 'Kniga syna'" // Mongolica V (Sankt-Peterburg, 2001). pp. 54–74.

Yakhontova, N. S. "Vliyanie tibetskogo yazyka na sintaksis oiratskikh perevodov" // Mongolica Pamyati Borisa Yakovlevicha Vladimirtsova (1884–1931) (Moskva, 1986). pp. 113–117.

Yampolskaya, N. V. "Ashtasahasrika-pradzhnyaparamita' v mongol'skom perevode oyratskogo Dzaya-pandity" // Strany i narody Vostoka XXXV (2014). pp. 391–401.

Yampolskaya, Natalia. Jadamba. Eight Mongolian Translations of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā sūtra, Asiatische Forschungen 158 (Wiesbaden, 2018).