

On the duplicated chapter of the mongolian Bodhicaryāvatāra

Shuyu Kanaoka

I

The “Bodhicaryāvatāra” in Mongolian translation is “Bodhisatōa-in yabodar dor orohoi neretu”, which is literally rendered as “(a sūtra) named an entering into Bodhisattva’s deeds”. Tibetam title mentioned in it is, as well as those of extant Peking and Derge edition, “byañ chub sems dpañi spyod pa la ḥjug pa ḥshugs so”. Sanskrit title there is “Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra”, where the word Bodhisattva is used instead of Bodhicarya which is used in extant Sanskrit text.

An available text of the Mongolian “Bodhicaryāvatāra” has been published by Russian scholar on Mongology, Prof. Be Ya Vladimirtsov in 1929 as vol. XXVIII of the Bibliotheca Buddhica⁽¹⁾, the original text of which is a manuscript found at Peking by Prof. O. Kowalewski and revised on which with reference to a Bstan-ḥgyur blockprint.⁽²⁾

As it is well known, with regard to the Sanskrit and Tibetan glossaries, there are two big volumes written by Prof. F. Weller.⁽³⁾ About the characteristics of the Mongolian translation of this work also, useful report has been published by the same author in his publication of the Tibetan text.⁽⁴⁾

With regard to the lineage of the text, Prof. Vladimirtsov, a publisher, explained as follows: Kowalewski Mss, the original text, was translated

(1) Bodhicaryāvatāra, Čāntideva, Mongoliskii perevod, Chos-kyi ḥod-zero, I te kst, izdal Be. Ya. Vladimirtsov. Bibliotheca Buddhica XXVIII, Leningrad 1929.

(2) ibid, preface p. II.

(3) F. Weller: Tibetisch-Sanskritischer Index zum Bodhicaryāvatāra, Berlin 2 Bde 1952, 1955, ditto: über den Quellenbezug eines mongolischen Tanjurtextes, Akademieverlag, Berlin 1950 (abbreviation F.)

(4) pp. 1~43 of the latter work, note (3)

by famous Mongolian scholar monk Chos kyi ḥod zer 1305 A. D. and was revised by famous linguist and translator Guši Bilig un Dalai 1748 A. D.

Moreover, it was discovered that some other kind of Mss or different kind of translation had been existed. First it was discovered and reported by our Prof. S. Hattori 1940 entitled "A Buddhist Canon excavated at Olon Sume"⁽⁵⁾, and was later identified that it was Bodhicaryāvatāra Gāthās from IX 56 to IX 60 by Prof. N. N. Poppe 1954.⁽⁶⁾

According to the latter's conclusion, this fragment is later than Kowalewski Mss, and from which it has some grammatical differences, so conclusionally said it represents the phraseology and style of calligraphy of the middle 14th Century.⁽⁷⁾

As it will be known by this example, translation of the Bodhicaryāvatāra into Mongolian was done not only once.

Now it must be asked the lineage of our Mongolian text basing on the Vladimirtsov publication. With regard to the Tibetan text, at the end of the work, stated as follows: Indian Pawdiwa (=Paṇḍita)⁽⁸⁾ Sarwa tswa dib-a (=Sarvajñādeva) and Great reviser (uciñci) and translator (helemulci=lo tsaḥ ba) Bandhia Dbal rčig revised and translated from Kaśmīr original (ehebicig or mother book) into Mongolian. By this, it is known that, first, from Kaśmīr Sanskrit text the Tibetan translation was rendered.

Later, it was retranslated with reference to the different texts and commentaries by Dharma śri bhadr-a (Dharmaśrībhadrā, bandig rinčin btsangabwa (lo tsaḥ ba rin chen bzañ po) and šahiy-a blowa grotas

(5) 服部四郎: オロンスム出土の経典, (『東方学報』東京, No. 11, Part 2, 1940 June. pp. 257~278).

(6) N. N. Poppe: A fragment of the Bodhicaryāvatāra from Olon Sūme, HJAS, vol. 17, Nos 3 & 4, Dec. 1954, pp. 411~418.

(7) ibid. pp. 415 & 418.

(8) Vladimirtsov (abbreviation V.) p. 169. "enethek un pawdiwa (paṇḍita) sarwa tswa dib-a (sarva-jñādeva) higet tubet un ujekči yehe helmulči bandhig ḍbal rčigs (bande dpal brtseg) neretu haśmīr (kaśmīra) on ehe bičig luge barildogoljo orčaholbai.

(116) On the duplicated chapter of the Mongolian B. A. (S. kanaoka)
(śākya blo gros)⁽⁹⁾.

Historical matters with regard to the Tibetan translation from Sanskrit above mentioned are reported completely samely at the end of the Tibetan three texts, i. e., Peking, Derge and Narthan editions. Details mentioned at the end of the Mongolian text is the repetition of the above, so as far as concern with the translators Mongolian text could not be rendered as a different kind from those of Tibetan.

After this, historical circumstances of the mongolian translation are stated as follows: Hitherto,⁽¹⁰⁾ we did not have a text translated (orosigoroksan) from Tibetan into Mongolian like this (volume), revising and referring here and there (edui tedui), I, the Bhikṣu Čoski otser (Chos kyi ḥod ser), for the sake of other's benefit, with a rhythum (ainlago) of Mongolian language, asking so many times, investigating this and that for clearances, without fear of confutation or question against this, supported by the omniscient,.....translated and introduced at the year of snake (magoi).

From the above, the following three points will be known, viz.;

- ① This mongolian translation is the first one.
- ② It is done by Chos kyi ḥod zer.
- ③ It is at the year of snake (or more exactly speaking "Kinoto-mi" of emperor Ch'êng tsung of Ynan dynasty, i. e., 9th of Ta-tê era, or 1305 A. D.)

Continued from the above, the historical events of the revision made by Guši Bilig un Dalai⁽¹¹⁾ is added as follows: revising three Mongolian texts, three Tibetan texts and three commentaries, supported by Living

(9) Mongolian: V., p. 169~170, Tibetan: F. S. 88; also Sanskrit: I. P. Minayev (abbreviation M.)'s Zapiski Vostochnago Otdiel, IV. 1889.

(10) V. p. 169.

ene metu orosigoroksan tubet un helel eče mongol on helel dor orite ugei in dolata edui tedui nailgolon juhiyeju bi čoshi otser (chos kyi ḥod zer) ayak ga dehimlay mongol olos on ailga bar bosat tor tosa bolho in tola debten debten sanosčo belge tehen.....magoi jil dor orosigolja tagosibai.

(11) Tibetan: śes rab rgya mtsho, or śe rgyam.

On the duplicated chapter of the Mongolian B. A. (S. kanaoka) (117)

Buddha Lčaṅ skya (or lcañ skya)⁽¹²⁾, he completely revised the text at the year of dotoran bibaya of arban godagar brbara (or 1748 A. D.).

II

Above historical statements explain how the Kowalewski Mss. and Bstan ḥgyur block print were completed after revisions of the original translation from Tibetan texts which are fundamentally similar to the extant texts.

But, now, it must be necessary to add a new fact to the above. It is the enlarged or duplicated parts of the Mongolian Bodhicaryāvatāra.

The Mongolian Bodhicaryāvatāra ended with the 58 th gāthās of the tenth Chapter which correspond to the Tibetan “Byaṅ chub sems dpaḥi spyod pa la ḥjug pa las bsño ba shes bya ba ste leḥu bcu paḥo”. After the 58 th gāthā historical statements above mentioned are added. But extant Mongolian text has another one chapter which are devoid both in Sanskrit and Tibetan (chinese also) texts.

At the end of the historical statement after the tenth chapter, closing address both in Tibetan and Mongolian are stated as follows: “The reverences (smon lam or pūjā) for the Entering into Bodhisattva’s deeds are finished”⁽¹³⁾. The duplicated chapter consist of 58 gāthās as a whole came after this closing address.

The contents of this duplicated parts will be seen later. Before that it must be necessary to see a postscript added at the end of the duplicated chapter. According to this, the translator newly translated the revised text which had been prepared revising three Mongolian texts, three Tibetan texts and three big commentaries with references to the introduction made by Living Buddha ljaṅ skya (lcañ skya) and also to

(12) He was the lcañ skya XIV, or rol paḥi rdo rjé ye śes thob paḥi bsod nams dpal bzañ (1717~1786).

(13) V. p. 171.

“tsariy-a awatar-a in irugel orosibai”: Tibetan mentioned there is; “spyod ḥjug gi smon lam bshugs so.”

(118) On the duplicated chapter of the Mongolian B. A. (S. kanaoka)

the commentaries (tailbor) and dictionaries (borok tulob) written by Gegen called Dharma rin chen. Translator's name is known as Ratna, through the statement that is I, the humble ordinary man, who has a name called Ratna.⁽¹⁴⁾

This new translation, however, does not cover the all ten chapters, as it will be stated later, but it was only one chapter, or the 10 th chapter, which was newly translated by him.

Moreover the date of this third translation is not reported at all.

III

Next, we must observe the contents and the characteristics of this duplicated chapter.

Generally speaking, this duplicated parts are similar with those of preceeding tenth chapter.

It begins with the first Gāthā saying that "In entering into Bodhisattva's deeds without falling back, I pray that every sentient being will enter into Bodhisattva's deeds by some benefit of this work (or Bodhicaryāvātā)," and ending with the 58 th chapter saying that "I salute to the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī who evokes the vow for good deeds by the benefits. Also I salute to the superior good teacher who taught me good deeds by his benefits".

The above mentioned are the literal translation of the Ratna's new translation, the differences of which from that of Chos kyi ḥod zer will be seen from the following table with references of the corresponding Sanskrit and Tibetan versions.

(1) 1 st gāthā

① Chos kyi ḥod zer's tr.

bi bodi yabodal dor orohoi gi johiyaksan ali tere boyan iyar teguber hamok amitan bodi yabodal dor orohon boldogai. (I, <pray> in⁽¹⁵⁾

(14) V. p. 184.

bi bereme ratna neretu daghai nigen.

(15) V. p. 159.

On the duplicated chapter of the Mongolian B. A. (S. kanaoka) (119)

entering into Bodhi(sattva)'s deeds by some benefit of this work,
(again I pray) by which, every sentient being will enter into
Bodhi(sattva)'s deeds.)

② Ratna's tr.

bowadhi sato-a in yabodal dor mino bocal ugei oroho gi saidor
togorbiksan boyan ali teguber hamok amitan bowadhi sato-a in
yabodal dor oroho boltogai.⁽¹⁶⁾

③ Corresponding Tibetan

bdag gis byañ chub spyod pa la /
ḥjug pa rnam par brtsams pa yi /
dge ba gañ des ḥgro ba kun /
byañ chub spyod la ḥjug par śog // ⁽¹⁷⁾

④ corresponding Sanskrit

bodhicaryāvatāram me yad vicintayataḥ śubham tena sarve janāḥ
santu bodhicaryāvibhūṣaṇāḥ ⁽¹⁸⁾ (1)

(2) 58 th gāthā

① chos kyi ḥod zer's tr.

hen o sain dor boyan o sethil turgulkci, manjosiri dor sugutmui
bi, hen u jibasa dor saijitoksan bugesu sain baksi tagan bar sugutmui
⁽¹⁹⁾ bi (I salute to the (Bodhisattva) Mañjuśrī who evoks good will
by his benefits. Also I salute to the good teacher who assisted me
by his helps.)

② Ratna's tr.

hen o ači bar boyan to sanaga gi turgulkči hedulgekči manjośri dor
murgumui. hen o ači bar nador boyan i telgeregulkči hedorgei sain
⁽²⁰⁾ baksi tagan murgumui.

③ corresponding Tibetan

(16) ibid. p. 173.

(17) F. S. 81.

(18) M. p. 221.

(19) V. p. 169.

(20) V. p. 183.

(120) On the duplicated chapter of the Mongolian B. A. (S. kanaoka)

gañ gi drin gyis dge blo ḥbyuñ /
ḥjam paḥi dbyaṅs la phyag ḥtshal lo /
gañ gi drin gyis bdag dar ba /
dge baḥi bśes Iḥaṅ bdag phyag ḥtsal⁽²¹⁾ //58//

④ corresponding Sanskrit

Mañjughoṣaṃ namasyāsmi yatprasādān matiḥ śubhe kalyāṇamitraṃ
vande'ham yet prasādācca vardhata⁽²²⁾ (58)

In spite of these literal differences, the contents of the both versions are completely same, which consist of the adorations for various Bodhisattvas, like Mañjuśrī, Samantabhadra, Avalokiteśvara and so on, transformation of female into male (gāthā 30), the merits of dhāraṇīs (gāthā 40). These will be samely seen in the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions.

As it will be seen from the above quotations, it must be concluded that this last additional chapter is a mere repetition of the tenth chapter of the original version. Therefore it will be proper to call this re-translation or duplication instead of enlargement. Indeed, at the end of this duplicated 10 th chapter, it is stated that “this is the *tenth* chapter entitled adoration in entering into Bodhisattva's deeds⁽²³⁾”. With this we can know that this is not the newly enlarged eleventh chapter but the duplicated tenth chapter.

Then, how finish the original tenth chapter ? At the end of the chapter, it is stated only that “the work written by Ācārya Śāntideva in entering into Bodhisattva's deeds.” This shows only conclusion of the whole work, being devoid of the conclusion of the tenth chapter, which is widely different from those of former nine chapters.

It is very difficult to infer this reason for the devoid of any fixed materials. The most probable conjecture of this reason is that Ratna, the

(21) F. s. 87.

(22) M. p. 225.

(23) V. p. 183.

bodisato-a nar on yabodal orohoi nenetu śastir jorin irugehui neretu arbadogar
buluk boi.

retranslator, eliminated the closing words of the tenth chapter, and added newty translated his tenth chapter, and after adding this he put this closing words at the end of his new versions. Otherwise it must be quite irrational that only the last chapter has not closing words among ten chapters each of which has similar closing words at the end of the chapter.

According to Prof. Vladimirtsov, Ratna was a Buriat Mongolian linguist, who retranslated the tenth chapter of Mongolian Bodhicaryāvatāra after completion of the Tibetan-mongolian, Sanskrit-Tibetan concordances. It is quite easy to understand that this historical statement is correct through the comparison of these two translations made by chos kyi ḥod zer and Ratna.⁽²⁴⁾

The general characteristics of Ratna's new translation will be found mainly in grammatical one instead of dogmatical contents. The foolowing two points must be noted :

- ① Inversion of the subject which was often found in the Chos kyi ḥod ser's translation, as will be seen from the above example, can not be found in the Ratna's new translation.
- ② The transcription of the Sanskrit vocabularies, especially that of sonant aspirate like gh, dh, bh becomes much more exactly comparing with the former one.

As it will be easily understood, this newly added 10 th chapter is not the enlargement of the text, but mere duplication of the last part of the original.

But it must be said that it is quite seldom only one chapter was retranslated and added to the former translation, It shows the brief history of the translations of the Mongolian Buddhist canon, starting from 14 th century and ending at 17 th century which was done by Zaya Paṇḍita into Oirat Mongolian. This newly translated versions by Ratna show the materials of the formation of the Mongolian Buddhist canons which was done more than several centuries. (a study by the help of the ministry of Education for the Coordinated Scientific Studies 1965.)

(24) V. p. V.