The Value of Mongolian Buddhist Works from the Linguistic, Philological and Historical Viewpoint[1]

HIGUCHI Kōichi

Introduction

It is widely supposed that Tibetan Buddhism was first propagated among the Mongols during the late 13th century, at which time works of Buddhist scripture were translated into Mongolian, only to be lost later on, meaning that most extant Mongolian versions of Buddhist scripture are Modern productions, whether in print or manuscript form. Even though their originals are of Middle origin, they have undergone revisions and Modernizations since the so-called "second introduction" of Tibetan Buddhism beginning in the latter half of the 16th century. However, doubts have arisen about such suppositions based on careful line-by-line investigation and analysis of the Mongolian texts produced from the late 16th century on. This new research has revealed the presence of archaic linguistic forms, many of which were completely obsolete at the time of production and were thus probably incomprehensible to contemporary readers. This is the reason why Mongolian Buddhist works are of great value from the viewpoint of Mongolian historical linguistics, since they make up for the dearth of linguistic materials related to Middle Mongolian compared to similar sources regarding Modern Mongolian.[2]

In addition, many errors can be detected, sometimes so careless as to doubt any proficiency in Tibetan on the part of the translator. And this is also true of the originals in Middle Mongolian. Such facts allow us to infer that the revisions and Modernizations of the Middle period originals were hastily and half-heartedly performed, and lead to doubts about the authenticity of the colophons attached to the Modern versions, in which the names of historical figures are mentioned.

The present article not only goes into more detail concerning the above discoveries, but also offers hypotheses related to the translation, compilation and transmission processes of Mongolian Buddhist works.

1. *Gośṛṅgavyāakaraṇa*

Let us first focus on *Qutuɣ-tu üker-ün aɣula-dur viyakirid ögdegsen neretü yeke kölgen sudur* (hereafter, *Üker-ün aɣula*). Although it begins with a Sanskrit title according to the convention of all Mongolian Buddhist works, the content is of Tibetan origin (*'Phags pa glang ru lung bstan pa shes bya ba theg pa chen po 'i mdo*: Tohoku 357 and Otani 1026) and there exist neither the Sanskrit original nor the Chinese translations; we have only Mongolian translations. We have four texts at our disposal: two of them are manuscripts, two printed editions. The manuscripts, which are kept in the Raghu Vira collection, share the same title, *Qutuɣ-tu üker-ün aɣula-dur vivangkirid üǰegülügsen neretü yeke kölgensudur* (Chandra 1982: 231−98). One printed edition, which is contained in a dhāraṇī collection is entitled *Tarnis-un quriyangɣui* or *Bzung dui* and was printed four times during the Qing period, is an adaptation of *Qutuɣ-tu üker-ün aɣula-dur viyakirid-i üǰegülügsen neretü yeke kölgen sudur*, which according to Heissig (1954: 61−62) is contained in PLB72. The second printing is included in the Mongolian Kanjur as K1211; namely, *Qutuɣ-tu üker aɣula-dur vivangkirid üǰügülügsen neretü yeke kölgen sudur* (Ligeti 1942−44: 302−3). We can classify them into two groups A and B as follows:

A: MONG. 06.02, MONG. 06.30 and PLB72
B: K1211

The texts of all the members of Group A are nearly identical, while the sole member of Group B is the only text that shows significant differences. The prose portion of the 19th chapter is a typical case of the differences between the two Groups.

19-0367-9[3]）
A. qaɣan ba :   noyad terigüten tegüs čaɣsabad-tan ba : süsüg-ten kiged :
B. qaɣan kiged noyad terigüten   saɣsabad-tan   süsüg-ten kiged :

A. ene oron ba nom-dur ǰokilduɣulun üiledügči   bügesü :
B. ulus-i   nom-dur adali   üileddügčin bolqu:
"if they were kings or noblemen who (had been taught the five precepts,) held deep faith in Buddhism and ruled this country according to Buddhist law,"

The fact that we have found no Mongolian manuscripts or printings of this work earlier than the 17th century may attribute little value to this work vis-a-vis the linguistic corpus of Middle Mongolian. However, in fact, the work was first translated into Mongolian from a Tibetan source during the Middle period, since it contains many archaic forms, some of which are so rarely found in Modern literature that they can only testify to the actual date of production. One of these forms is Mo. *čaγsabad*, (the five precepts [against killing, stealing, bearing false witness, coercion and self-destruction]) which is found once in Group A. This form is a direct reflex of Uig. čaqsapat, of which the ultimate origin is Skt. sikṣāpada, reflects the original Uighur form, more faithfully than the innovative form, *saγsabad*, with a fricative at the initial position, as is found in B. Even in works of the 14th century, the innovated forms with the initial *s-* were far more prevalent than *čaγsabad* or *čiγsabad*, then later in the Modern works, all the archaic equivalents were swept away as obsolete. The presence of such forms testifies to the Middle Mongolian origin of Version A.

The above example may give the impression that B is merely a revised version of A with the obsolete form being replaced with its modern equivalent. However, it is not only in A that we come across archaic forms, such as *ǰilmaγan* (soft), *sayiǰid-* (to get better) and *munda* (again). *ǰilmaγan*, which appears twice in B, has been found so far only in *Lalitavistara* and *Ratnajāli*. B also contains two instances of *sayiǰid-*, which has been found occurring once in *Bodhicaryāvatāra* and twice in *Bhadracarya*, as well as one instance of *munda*, which appears only in a few Middle Mongolian works, such as *The Secret History of the Mongols*. The fact that we find such forms in B is demonstrative proof for its Middle Mongolian origin. Thus, we can be certain that the originals of both versions were produced in the 14th century.[4]

Nevertheless, these findings are contradictory to the description contained in the colophon. Only MONG. 06.30 of Group A has a detailed colophon, which states that it was translated from Tibetan into Mongolian by Curlim rǰamso, Byamba rǰamso and Sirab rǰamso and was devoted to Ilaγuγsan buyan-u erketü burqad-un buniya siri dayun qung taiǰi. The names of the three translators unfortunately can not be found in the extant historical record, but the one honored with the work was a grandson of Altan qan of Tümet, alive in 1605 (Heissig 1962: 47−48). This means that the colophon is misinforming us; for even if the three unidentified monks did actually exist in the 16th and the 17th centuries, they could not have translated the Tibetan original into Middle Mongolian, but at best

may have revised the 14th century text. Otherwise, it would be impossible to explain why so many archaic forms rarely found even in Middle Mongolian appear in the text, since such forms would have been so obsolete and hard to handle for any monks living two centuries later in the Modern period. Moreover, it would be wrong to regard them as fabrications meant to mislead contemporaries as to the age of the "translation." This is because if we assume it was revision that was attempted by the three, the result is so incomplete that obsolete forms have been left untouched in the text. The next passage which is found in the 11th chapter also shows the incompleteness of any possible revision.

11-017-31[5]
A. *eke-dür* nadur nigen köbegün bui bolbasu : olangki burqan adistid kigsen oron-dur : tere oron-i bariǰu saɣuqui kemen sedkiǰü
B. *ay-a*   nadur nigen köbegün bui bolbasu olangki burqan adistid orosiɣsan tere oron-dur : ulus-i bariɣulsuɣai kemen sedkiǰü bür-ün :
"(He thought,) 'Alas, if I ever have a son, he shall have his kingdom in that land which is blessed by many Buddhas.' and..."

To begin with, there is a significant contrast between the lead-in to A, *eke-dür* (to the mother) and that to B *ay-a* (alas!), so much so that the former becomes completely incomprehensible in the Mongolian context. However, upon reference to the Tibetan passage, which begins with the expression "*ma-la*," which has been mistranslated in A due to interpreting "*ma*" as mother and "*la*" as a locative particle; ergo, the Mongolian *eke-dür* (to the mother). Needless to say, B interprets "*ma-la*" correctly as a simple exclamation, meaning 'moreover, furthermore' and used in this instance as a "call of compassion." The misinterpretation in A is so egregious that even a novice in the study of Tibetan could not have overlooked it. The fact that such an elementary error has remained uncorrected tells us that any revision was made hastily and half-heartedly by a monk(s) ill-versed in even basic Tibetan. Moreover, this fact also leads to the supposition that the original 14th century translation was by no means meticulous, suggesting that it too was rendered by a monk(s) not well versed in Tibetan. In view of the masterpieces of Tibetan-Middle Mongolian translation, beginning with Chos kyi 'od zer's *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, while we would like to assume that all the Tibetan works translated during that period achieved such standards, the evidence of shoddy work presented here shows such an assumption to be far from the truth. We will return to this issue later

on.

Secondly, a cursory comparison between versions A and B may give again the impression that B is a revised version of A, which again turns out to be false as soon as one reads the following passage in the second chapter. To wit,

2-2-007-8[6]
A modgalayani terigüten mingɣan qoyar ǰaɣun tabin yekes siravaɣ-ud
B modgalayani terigüten   qoyar ǰaɣun tabin yekes esru-a
"One thousand two hundred and fifty great śrāvaka all with the head of Maudgalyāyana."

The term "one thousand" (Tib. *stong*) has obviously been left out of B, since "1,250 great śrāvaka (disciples)" is a standard idiomatic phrase appearing throughout Buddhist scripture. This fact presents further proof of the incompleteness not only of any possible revision, but also of the original 14th century Mongolian translation. The same seems to hold true for other Mongolian Buddhist works.

2. *Ratnajāliparipṛcchā*

Although a Sanskrit version of this work does not exist, there are Chinese and Tibetan translations, in addition to the Mongolian.[7] A manuscript and four xylographs of the Mongolian versions of this work are available at present and can be classified into three groups in terms of their philological and linguistic features.[8]

A: H5801 of the Hedin Collection of the Ethnographical Museum of Sweden
B: H1830a of the Hedin Collection and two Beijing blockprints, PLB 4 and 39
C: K919, a Kanjur version

Given the various typical Middle Mongolian forms found in its text, H5801 may be assumed to be the oldest of the five versions and originally produced in the Middle period, although the extant manuscript is not a production of that period. Group B consists of a manuscript and two xylographs with nearly identical texts. The manuscript, H1830a, has no colophon but in the light of its calligraphy can be assumed to be a production

of the 17th century at the earliest. The xylographs are part of a collection of Buddhist works which were printed in Beijing beginning in the 17th century. The former (PLB 4) was printed in 1650 and the latter (PLB 39) in 1717, but have no colophons, thus depriving us of the names of their translators or revisers. The xylograph comprising Group C is contained in a Mongolian Buddhist canon compiled during the 18th century by the imperial order of the Qing Dynasty. Only this version has a colophon, which relates that it is a revision of the translation by Ünükü-tü bilig-tü tai güüsi, who is described in one historical source as a monk who played a central role, together with Samdan sengge and Toyin čorji and so forth in the publication of the Mongolian Kanjur under the reign of Ligdan Qan of Čaqar in the 17th century (Heissig 1954: 41); however, it will be shown that this information was fabricated, based on philological and linguistic facts that prove it was a production of the 18th century.

In the works of all three groups, we encounter many characteristic forms of Middle Mongolian, most noteworthy among them pre-classical *-qi-* orthography, as well as forms like *büsire-* (to believe in), *güre-* (to beg), *ǰilmaɣan* (soft), *siɣun* (voice), *bilge bilig* (perfect wisdom) and *quvraɣ* (monk). The following is an example of *-qi-* orthography peculiar to pre-classical written Mongolian—that is, the written language of Middle Mongolian not found in Modern literature. Since literary works which have gone through Modernization or revision in modern times substitute *-ki-* for *-qi-*, we can utilize it as an index of the period of production. We find *-qi-* appearing a total of 16 times in A, and all incidents have been replaced with *-ki-* in the works of the other Groups. In the case of Verse 35,[9]

35-a[10]
A ked ba doloɣan edür söni :
B ked ba doloɣan edür söni :
C ked ba doloɣan edür söni :
(b)
A bürin ilaɣuɣsan-u ner-e-yi baribasu :
B bürin ilaɣuɣsan-u ner-e-yi baribasu :
C bürin ilaɣuɣsan-u ner-e-yi baribasu :
(c)
A burqan-a sayisiyaɣdaɣsan qiǰaɣalal ügegü :
B burqan-a sayisiyaɣdaɣsan kiǰaɣalal ügegü :
C burqan-a sayisiyaɣdaɣsan kiǰaɣalal ügegü :

(d)
A teyin büged ariɣun nidü-tü boluyu ::
B teyin büged ariɣun nidü-tü boluyu ::
C teyin büged ariɣun nidü-tü boluyu ::
"Anyone who for seven days and nights consecutively recites the holy name of the Conqueror [Buddha], will be praised by Buddha and be bestowed with limitless and perfectly clear vision and will be able to easily gaze upon all the Buddhas."

Given the fact that *-qi-* orthography and other Middle forms have survived only in Group A, we can regard this manuscript as the most faithful variant of the 14th century original transmitted to later periods, although the absence of a colophon prevents us from making any conjecture about the process of its transmission.

Textual comparison of the three groups shows that A is the nearest to the 14th century, while B is a revised version of A and C, decisively an imperial version from the 18th century, is a further revision of B. Such textual dependency, supported in part by the following analysis of errors found in the texts, clearly demonstrates the content of the only existing colophon to be false. The works in Groups B and C cannot be considered to have been originally translated in the 17th century, because they contain Modernizations of some, but not all, obsolete forms, such as *-qi-* orthography and Mo. *blige bilig* and *quvraɣ*, which are found in A. This Modernization was, however, not so comprehensive that Mo. *güre-*, *ǰilmaɣan* and *siɣun*, obsolete in the 17th century, were left unchanged. Further detailed examination of the texts seems to show that the anonymous translator(s) of A committed not a few errors in interpreting the Tibetan source; and while some of these errors have been corrected in the works of Groups B and C, most have remained intact. For example,

0047-a[11]
A ende ibegel-ün ner-e-yi sonosbasu :
B ende ibegel-ün ner-e-yi sonosbasu :
C ende ibegel-ün ner-e-yi sonosbasu :
(b)
A masida čiɣuluɣsan linqu-a egesig-tü :
B masida čiɣuluɣsan lingqu-a egesig-tü :
C masida čiɣuluɣsan degedü-yin egesig-tü :

(c)
A samadi-yi ödter olqu bol-un :
B samadi-yi ödter olqu bolun :
C samadi-yi ödter olqu bolun :
(d)
A költi erdem-üd-i sayitur daɣurisqayu ::
B költi erdem-üd-i sayitur daɣurisqayu ::
C költi erdem-üd-i sayitur daɣurisqayu ::
"If they heard here the name of the Savior [Buddha], it would sound like the voice of assembled lotus [*sic*] and help them quickly attain dhyāṇa [perfect equanimity], and [thus] glorify limitless virtue."

Notable here is the contrasting texts of the second stanza: A and B rendering the Tibetan into *lingqu-a* (lotus) in contrast to C rendering it *degedü-yin* (of the superior; i.e., sacred). The unintelligible 'voice of a lotus' is nowhere to be found in either the Tibetan or Chinese versions and the Tibetan original term is *dam pa* (holy), leading us to the conclusion that the translators of A misread the term as *pad ma* (lotus), the authors of B retained it and those of C corrected the error. This could have never happened if the translator(s) of the 14th century had consulted texts other than the Tibetan version, which leads us to conclude that 1) the Mongolian versions were wholly dependent on one Tibetan original and 2) that the 14th century translators were either lacking in Tibetan proficiency or at least sufficient time and attention to accurately translate the Tibetan text. The fact that the error was not corrected in B, a revised version of the 17th century, leads to a similar conclusion that the revision was very superficial and may have also been conducted in haste. On the other hand, the fact that the error was corrected in C, whose colophon boasts that its was done by Ünükü-tü bilig-tü tai güüsi, may suggest that it was more carefully and expertly done; however, closer inspection reveals the correction to be a rather exceptional case, as is shown in the Verse 118.

0118-a[12)]
A buyan tegüsüüɣsen mingɣan köbegüd-tü bolǰu :
B buyan tegüsügsen mingɣan köbegüd-tü bolǰu :
C buyan tegüsüüɣsen mingɣan köbegüd-tü bolǰu :
(b)
A baɣatur küčün ǰirüke-tü činadus-un ayimaɣ-i daruɣči :
B baɣatur küčün ǰirüke-tü činadus-un ayimaɣ-i daruɣči :

C baγatur küčün ǰirüke-tü činadus-un ayimaγ-i daruγči :
(c)
A degedü sayin öngge lagsan-iyar čimegdegsen :
B degedü sayin öngge lagsan-iyar čimegdegsen :
C degedü sayin öngge lagsan-iyar čimegdegsen :
(d)
A yeke küčün auγ-a-tu erkin qaγan-dur adali ::
B yeke küčün auγ-a-tu erkin qaγan-dur adali ::
Č yeke küčün auγ-a-tu erkin qaγan-dur adali ::
"Having a thousand sons blessed with prosperity, a hero, a center of
power, conquering relatives of the other side, possessing supreme and
beautiful form, a king with great dignity."

Here line (b) is problematic. To begin with the term *baγatur* 'hero', of
which the equivalent is 勇猛英雄 (lit. bold and heroic) in Chinese, here
refers to the fearlessness and sacrifice characteristic of the Buddhas and
bottisatvas. Secondly, the phrases *küčün ǰirüke-tü* (a center of power) and
činadus-un ayimaγ-i daruγči (conquering relatives on the other side) make no
sense and in fact have not equivalents in the Chinese version. However,
there is a corresponding Tibetan text, *dpa zhing rtul phod pa rol tshogs 'joms
la*, which reveals the series of misinterpretations responsible for such an
awkward translation. The suffix *zhing* of *dpa zhing*, meaning "while he is a
hero," had been mistakenly rendered as "center," since both terms look
similar in Tibetan orthography. The phrase *rtul phod pa rol thsogs 'joms la*,
which should read "being bold and a conqueror over sensual pleasure,"
falls victim to a kind of misguided meta-analysis, with *pa*, the last part of
rtul phod pa (bold) being read as *pha*, then mistakenly joined with the fol-
lowing *rol*, which is actually the Tibetan verb meaning "to amuse." This
mismatch produces "*pha rol*" taken to mean "the other side, or far shore,"
the well-known Buddhist metaphor for nirvāṇa. This misreading should
have been readily noticed, if only the revisers had either read the Tibetan
text more carefully or had consulted the Chinese version. Besides, such
a strange expression as "conquering relatives of the other side" should
have aroused suspicion among monks who were supposed to have been
so well-versed in Buddhist doctrine that they were appointed compilers of
the Mongolian canons.

These facts should be sufficient in convincing us that what Ünükü-
tü bilig-tü tai güüsi, mentioned in the C Group colophon as the transla-

tor of that 17th century version, actually did was to merely revise the original 14th century translation loosely and hurriedly. Moreover, it is more likely that some anonymous monk, far less learned than he, did the work using his name. This case also suggests extreme caution when evaluating the information contained in the colophons of Buddhist works, especially when they are modern versions produced after the so-called "second introduction" of Tibetan Buddhism, even though their originals were produced in the 14th century. In any case, owing to what can only be termed indifference, many errors made at the time of the first translations were left uncorrected at the stages of the B and C Groups, leading to the conclusion that not only the original 14th century translations and their later modernized revisions, but also the decisive versions compiled by the Qing Dynasty are all far from being either precise or elaborate.

3. *Ratnaguṇasaṁcayagāthā*

The Sanskrit original of this work consists of a single work of about 300 verses, while in Tibet this text was not only published as a single work but also incorporated into a larger work; namely, as the 84th chapter of *Aṣṭādaśa-sāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā (Perfect Wisdom consisting of 18,000 verses).* The Tibetan tradition was also adopted in the Mongolian canons. There are eight Mongolian texts at our disposal, and they all are printings done in the 18th century which can be classified into three groups.[13]

A: One Kanjur version, K767, and a Beijing xylograph, PLB34
B: Four xylographs contained in a Dhāraṇī collection, PLB13, 49, 67 and 42
C: Chapter 84 of two xylographs of *the 18,000-verse Perfect Wisdom*, K764 and PLB32

The members of Group A each consists of 300 verses and are all divided into 9 chapters, while those of Group B and C contain 302 verses and are divided into 8 chapters.[14] In Groups A and B we find so many archaic forms, some of which are rarely found in the Middle Mongolian literature that we can assume their originals were translated from Tibetan in the 14th century. The versions of Groups A and B also suffer from translating errors, implying again the shoddiness of the translation work done in the 14th century; and again many of these errors have been retained in the revisions of the Modern age. However, no archaic forms can be found in

the members of Group C, indicating not only the Modernization of the Middle Mongolian translations, but also a re-translation of *Perfect Wisdom*, probably during the compilation of the Mongolian Kanjur. This latter event is suggested by the following comparison of Verse 8-2 of *Perfect Wisdom*.

8-2(a)[15]
A baγatud büjig-iyer yabur-un   bilig baramid-iyar :
B baγatud büjig-iyer yabur-un   bilig baramid-un küčün-iyer :
C baγatur qamiγ-a   yabuqui-dur bilig baramid-iyar :
(b)
A γurban yirtinčü-eče üneker nögčiged teyin büged toniluγsan ber busu :
B γurban yirtinčü-eče maγad nögčiged bügetele nirvan-dur aqu ber busu :
C γurban yirtinčü-eče üneker nögčigsen bügetele sayitur getülügsen ču busu
(c)
A nisvanis-i arilγaγad bügetele ber töröl-i üjügülyü :
B nisvanis-i arilγaγad bügetele ber töröl-i üjügülyü :
C nisvanis-i arilγaγsan bolbaču törökü-yi   üjügülün üiledümüi :
(d)
A ötelkü   ebedkü   ükükü ügei ber bügesü ükül yegüdkel-i üjügül-ün bui ::
B ötelkü   ebedkü   ükükü ügei ber bügesü ükül yegüdkel-i üjügül-ün bui ::
C ötelkü kiged ebedkü ba ükükü ügei bolbaču   ükün yegüdkeküi-yi üjügülmüi ::
"Having, through Wisdom, comprehended the essential nature of the Dharma, He completely transcends the worlds of instinct, material and emotion and their states of woe. Having turned the precious wheel of the Mightiest of Men, He imparts the Dharma to the world for the complete extinction of suffering."

The replacement in the first line of *büjg-iyer* (by dancing) in A and B with *qamiγ-a* (where(ever)) in C is far too radical to assume that the two translations correspond to one original. The key here is the word *gar*, which is a homonym meaning both "dance" and "whither, where." Since the Sanskrit version reads *yatra* "to which place, where," we now know which

word is appropriate. The choice of "dance" by the translators or revisers of A and B shows that they consulted only the Tibetan original and were ill-versed in Tibetan to boot. Secondly, the use of *yabur-un* (performing) in the first line of A and B indicates the employment of the preparatory gerundive suffix *-run*, which is only found in a few fossilized idioms, such as *ügüler-ün* (saying (that)...), in Modern literature, but was widely and productively employed in Middle Mongolian. More demonstrative proof for the antiquity of A and B is contained in the following passage.[16]

> I-6(c)
> A tere   qamuɣ nom-ud-tur ülü an orosil   ügegüi-e yabuǰu :
> B tere bodisdv qamuɣ nom-ud-tur ülü an aɣal   ügegüi-e yabuǰu :
> C tere   nom bükü-dür   ülü orosin orosiɣči ügegüi-e yabumu :
> "He (who has no sensual addiction) does not rest upon any being, but continues to practice, without abiding in any place"

We discover in A and B a very precious form, *an* (resting), the verb *a-* (to be), which became obsolete in Modern Mongolian, but had been productively used in Middle Mongolian, followed by *-n*, a suffix of the modal gerund. This form is replaced with an equivalent form, *orosin*, in C. Only three instances of this form have been reported so far: in a letter written by Öljeitü to Philippe le Bell in 1305, the Turfan manuscript fragments of *the tale of Alexander* and xylographic fragments of *Kaojing* 孝經. And now we have the fourth instance.[17]

Returning to Verse 8-2, there is the use by C of the concessive particle *ču* (even) in line two and the concessive gerundive suffix *-baču* in *bolbaču* (even if he/there is) in the third and fourth lines. *-baču* was originally a combination of a past perfective finite suffix verb and the concessive particle. Neither this *ču* nor *-baču* ever appeared in the Middle Mongolian literature, so that their occurrence should provide ample proof that C is a modern re-translation or a comprehensive revision. As far as we know, the earliest usage of *-baču* appears in a Mongolian document contained in *Manwen Yuandang* 滿文原檔, dated in 1632, as *-bači*, an orthographical variant of *-baču* (Kuribayashi and Hailan 2015: 145). The concessive particle has been used 78 times as an independent word and 35 times as the suffix of the concessive gerund, as in C, while no usage of this particle cannot be found in either A or B.

More proof provided by C for its modernity is the usage of a deictic form *mön* (the very same) as a copula found in the following stanza:

17-7(d)[18]
A tedeger kemebesü ülü ničuqui belges buyu kemen medegdeküi ::
B tedeger kemebesü ülü ničuqui belge buyu kemen medegdeküi ::
C ülü ničuqui-yin belge anu edeger mön kemen medegdeküi
"These should be wisely understood as the characteristics of the ir-reversible."

It should be noted that *mön* in C is the equivalent of the genuine copu-lative form, *buyu*, in A and B, and frequently appears in contemporary Mongolian as a copula, while it has yet to be found in Middle Mongolian. One of the presumably earliest usages of this form as part of a copula ap-pears in another *Manwen Yuandang* document also dated 1632, where we find it in the construction, *mön bol-* (Kuribayashi and Hailan 2015: 153). This means that the grammaticalization of this form from a substantive to a copula was still under way in the early 17th century.

In light of the above findings, we may suppose that the Mongolian version of *the 18,000-verse Perfect Wisdom* is a modern and elaborate re-translation of the Tibetan or at least a comprehensive revision of the older versions. On the other hand, while the work's language is clearly Mongo-lian not of the Middle period, but of the 17th century or thereabout, again we are faced with the same kind of fundamental errors we have already encountered in other works, which call into question such qualifiers as "elaborate" and "comprehensive." For example,

15-4(a)[19]
A tere metü yabuγči   dalai erdem-tü ügülekü-yin   saran boluγad :
B tere metü yabuγči   dalai erdem-tü ügülekü-yin   saran boluγad :
C tere metü yabudal-tu sayitur amuduraγči ügülekü-yin saran boluγad :
"Thus navigating the Oceans of Qualities, the Moons of the doctrine (become the shelter of the world.)"

The form *sayitur amuduraγči* (one who lives appropriately) appearing in C seems quite awkward in this context; moreover, its equivalent form cannot be found either in A and B or in the Tibetan original. Instead, the use of *dalai erdem-tü* in A and B is faithful to the frequently used Tibetan epithet meaning "the Oceans of Qualities." It may be the case of some unknown translator or reviser misreading *mtsho* (lake), which is found in fact in the equivalent Tibetan line, as *'tsho* (to live), since the two terms look alike in Tibetan orthography, although it goes without saying that

anyone well-versed in Tibetan would never commit such an error. Thus, similar to the two works previously discussed, the Mongolian version of *the 18,000-verse Perfect Wisdom* is not free from amateurish mistakes, leading to the conclusion that it is a new translation or a modernized revision and that the monks who produced it were either poorly prepared in Tibetan and virtually ignorant of Buddhist doctrine, or else were under undue pressure to finish the work on short notice.

4. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*

Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, the *Lotus Sutra*, which is a far better-known and much more voluminous work than those discussed so far in this article, still poses vexing questions for researchers of the Mongolian Buddhist canons. It was first translated into Mongolian based on the Uighur translation of Kumālajīva's Chinese translation (妙法蓮華經: Taisho 262). No copies of the translation itself exist, but there are two fragmentary leaves of it in the so-called Turfan documents: Texts 27 and 28 of BTT XVI (Cerensodnom and Taube 1993: 108−13). On both linguistic and philological grounds, we are convinced that these fragments are parts of the translation of the Uighur text done in the 14th century, although the content does not co-incide with the extant Mongolian texts.[20] One of the fragments contains a passage revealing that it is the ending of the Sutra's 25th chapter. Inci-dentally, the Uighur version consists of 28 chapters in accordance with Kumālajīva's Chinese translation, while the Tibetan version consists of 26 chapters in accordance with another Chinese translation by Jñānagupta and Dharmagupta (添品妙法蓮華經: Taisho 264). Therefore, the passage in question is located at the end of the 25th chapter of the former, but is found in the 24th chapter of the latter. This fact proves that the Turfan fragments of the earliest Mongolian translation of this work were based on the Uighur version, meaning that their text cannot be reconstructed without referring to that version.

The extant complete Mongolian versions of the *Sutra* consist of four xylographs and one manuscript. Three of the printings are productions of the 18th century, one of which is contained in the Mongolian canons, while the other two belong to the so-called Beijing xylographs: PLB16 be-ing printed in 1711; PLB178 in 1786. Based on their calligraphic features, the fourth xylograph, T22, and the manuscript, H1058B, were produced no earlier than the 17th century.[21] In terms of the number and arrange-ment of chapters, they can be classified into two groups, A and B.[22]

A: PLB16 and H1058B of the Hedin collection[23]
B: K868, PLB178 and T22, held by Toyo Bunko

The members of Group A consist of 28 chapters, while those of Group B consist of 27, due to the fact that Chapters 11 and 12 of the former version have been combined into a single chapter in the latter. Moreover, the arrangement of the chapters after Chapter 21 in the former and after Chapter 20 in the latter is quite different, as shown in the following table:

Group A	11	12	13	14......20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Group B	11		12	13......19	20	27	22	23	24	21	25	26	

It is worth noting that the number and the order of chapters of Group A is the same as the Uighur version, while those of Group B parallel the Tibetan version; but despite such differences, the actual content of both Groups is based on the Tibetan version, as will be shown later.

It is only PLB16 that contains a detailed colophon describing the work as a revision of the original translation by Chos kyi 'od zer and Erdeni mergen dayicing tayiǰi, who consulted another Mongolian version translated by Siregetü guusi. All of these translators appear in the historical record: Chos kyi 'od zer was a monk of the 14th century and renowned translator of many Buddhist works including the Mongolian version of *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, considered to be a masterpiece of Mongolian literature, while the other two were well-known translators active from the late 16th to the early 17th century (Heissig 1962: 1−22). Nevertheless, at the mere sight of the passage cited below, doubts arise as to the reliability of the colophon's information.

III-15(a)
A kölgendür   uduridduɣčidun ǰarliɣ-i sonosuɣad :
B angqa urida uduridduɣčidun ǰarliɣ-i sonosuɣad :
(b)
A ene orondur burqanu čimegiyer ilete   qubilɣaqui ba :
B ene orondur burqanu čimegiyer iledte qubilɣaqui ba :
(c)
A ada simnusa ülü ilaɣdaqui bügediyer :
B ada simnusa ülü ilaɣdaqui bügediyer :

(d)

A tere metü nadur ayul ügei küčün töröbei ::

B tere metü nadur ayul ügei küčün töröbei ::

"After I first heard this teaching of the Buddha, I was greatly startled and thought, 'I wonder if Māra, pretending to be the Buddha, is confusing me!'"

The English translation is not a direct rendering translation of the Mongolian text, but rather of the Tibetan source, since the Mongolian suffers from three errors which would confuse any such attempt. The most striking overall feature is the similarity between A and B, strongly suggesting that both versions were dependent on the same source. Only one discrepancy can be found, at the very beginning of the first line, where *kölgendür* (on the vehicle) contrasts with *angqa urida* (at first). By referring to the corresponding Tibetan text, *thog ma rnam par 'den gyi gsung thos nas*, one can easily see that *thog ma* (origin) was misread as *theg pa* (vehicle) in A. This is a mistake that any novice in Tibetan orthography would no doubt make. The fact that *thog ma* was read correctly in B, however, does not mean that it is free from careless errors. The latter half of this verse (lines (c) and (d)), in which the content of A and B is identical, translates word to word from the Mongolian as "owing to the fact that I am not conquered by Māra, like that, fearless power is born to me" and obviously makes no sense. Two fatal errors are responsible for the confusion in light of the Tibetan source, *di bdud rkyal ka byed pa ma yid grang / de ltar bdag ni bag tsha 'i rtobs skyes so*. The first component of *rkyal ka* 'jest (joke) in (c) has been misread as *rgyal* (to conquer) with *ka* left untranslated, while *ni*, a topicalizing particle, is mistaken for *mi*, a negative particle in line (d). This passage provides us with conclusive proof that the members of Group A were based exclusively on a Tibetan source, since the errors they committed could have been easily avoided if their translator(s) had consulted the Uighur version translated from the Chinese. The original Tibetan verse is not very easy to interpret for anyone; however, the obvious lack of expertise in either Tibetan or Buddhist ideas on the part of the translator(s) resulted in a completely unintelligible Mongolian text. Moreover, Chos kyi 'od zer and Siregetü guusi, both legends in Buddhist scholarship, could never have committed such errors, leading us to conclude once more that it was untrained monks, using the names of these experts, that produced the original of Version A, as well as another translation reportedly consulted at the time of the revision. It goes without saying that if Erdeni mer-

gen dayicing tayiǰi had been really involved in the revision, such errors would never have been made. Moreover, the fact that only one error out of three was corrected in Version B, a Kanjur version, attests to the task of revising at the time of compilation of the Mongolian Buddhist canons as half-heartedly carried out in haste, with only a few superficial corrections being made.[24]

There is a possibility that our two Turfan fragments were parts of Chos kyi 'od zer's 14th century translation of the work based on a Uighur source, but the originals of Group A diverged from this translation, due to the fact that they totally depended on a Tibetan source, as shown above. It may be that at a certain point in history some anonymous monk, under the name Erdeni mergen daicing tayiǰi, tried to revise a translation based on a Tibetan source produced by an equally unknown translator, assuming the name Samdan sengge, according to the number and arrangement of chapters of the Chinese version, all for the purpose of utilizing the authority of Chos kyi 'od zer. This same Tibetan-based translation may have then been utilized as the original for the compilation of the Mongolian Kanjur, involving superficial corrections and linguistic Modernization of the text.

6. Pseudo Uighurisms in Mongolian Buddhist Works

Hopefully the discussion so far concerning the works of Buddhist scripture highlighted in the article has sufficiently demonstrated that they are all Mongolian translations based on Tibetan sources and produced after Tibetan Buddhism was introduced into Mongolia and became the dominant system of belief. Even at that time, however, both the language and Buddhist beliefs of the Uighurs were still held in high regard, due to their prestigious heritage as the pioneers of Mongolian orthography and Buddhism. In fact, many genuine Uighur loanwords grace the texts of Mongolian Buddhist works, some, like *bodisdv* (bodhisattva), having survived intact and others being transformed; for example, *čaɣsabad* (Buddhist discipline) > *šaɣšabad*, as we have already seen. To the contrary, loanwords from Tibetan are surprisingly fewer than those borrowed from Uighur, even after Tibetan Buddhism became predominant.

The idea that Uighur was awarded high prestige among the Mongols can be also confirmed by the presence of pseudo-Uighurisms, Uighur-like forms specially fabricated for use in Mongolian Buddhist works. Shogaito Masahiro [1991] was the first to point out this particular characteristic of

Mongolian Buddhist terminology; that is, forms invented in the Middle period which at first sight appear to be loanwords from Uighur. One example is Mo. *anandi* (Ānanda, the most inquisitive disciple of Buddha) found in a Middle Mongolian version of *Pancarakṣā*, which looks like it was borrowed from Uighur, since its final vowel, *-i*, reminds us of many actual Uighur loanwords, such as Mo. *kinari* < Uig. *kinari* << Skt. *kiṇṇara* (the musicians of Kuvera with men's body and horses' heads) and Mo. *šaribudari*, *šaribudiri* < Uig. *šariputiri* << Skt. *śāriputra* (Śāriputra, the senior disciple of Buddha). However, in the case of *anandi*, the Uighur transformation of the Skt. *ānanda* is *anant*; and there is no form in the other adjacent languages, such as Tocharian and Sogdian, resembling *anandi*. As to how and why such pseudo-Uighurisms came to exist, one probable explanation is that some Mongolian monk, who was not very skilled at Uighur, but convinced of a general tendency for Mongolian loanwords from Uighur to end in *-i*, attempted to "create" a Uighur form, and thus emulate Uighur's linguistic and spiritual prestige, by changing the final vowel of the original Sanskrit form at hand through transcription into Tibetan script. In fact this "tendency" is far from a general rule, being valid only for words borrowed by Uighur from Sanskrit via Tocharian. For example, Skt. Ānanda was introduced to Uighur via a different route, producing Uig. *anant*, not anandi.

Fabrications found in the Mongolian Buddhist works discussed so far are much more elaborate than this. For example, in *Üker-ün aɣula*, which was the focus of section one, there is the following prose passage near the beginning of the very first chapter.

1-0012
A. olan kinaris : ba   ruba garubi qaɣan terigüten cambudvib-daki kümün
B. olan kiniris kiged : bimbasari   qaɣan terigüten canbudvib-un kümün
"(Buddha sat with) many demons and human beings dwelling in the land of Jambudvipa, including King Bimbasara."

Noteworthy here is the contrast between A's *ruba garbi* and B's *bimbasari*. Anyone acquainted with Sanskrit could easily see that the original form of the former is a compound of Skt. *rūpa* (color) and *garbha* (inside) and that of the latter is another compound of Skt. *bimba* (shape) and *sāra* (core). The fact that the final Skt. *-a* corresponds to Uig. *-i* leads to the assumption

of their Uighur origin in terms of the presumed "general tendency" shown above. Referring to the corresponding Tibetan text, *'mi am ci dum dang rgyal po gzugs can snying po*, which must be the source of the Mongolian, because no Sanskrit version of the work exists, we discover that both Mo. *ruba garbi* and Mo. *bimbasari* correspond to Tib. *gzugs can snying po*. The problem now arises as to the difference between two Mongolian phrases which seem to have been borrowed from Uighur (which was ultimately borrowed from Sanskrit), but in reality are translated from a Tibetan source.

Mo. *bimbasari* in B can be regarded as corresponding to Skt. *bimbasāra* or *bimbisāra* (Ch. 頻婆娑羅), which is the name of a King of the Magada kingdom and a contemporary of Buddha. There exist two Mongolian versions of *Mahāvyutpatti*, a multilingual Buddhist terminological dictionary utilized in the translation of Buddhist texts into Mongolian: one being the canonical version (Ishihama-Fukuda 1989), the other a quadralingual manuscript version (Chandra 1981, Sárközi-Szerab 1995). The latter prescribes Mo. *dürstü-yin ǰirüken [qaɣan]* ([King of] the center of substances) as the equivalent of Skt. *bimbisāra*, while the former prescribes Mo. *bimbisara (qaɣan)* (No. 3647 of Sárközi-Szerb 1995 and No. 3645 of Ishihama-Fukuda 1989). In other words, we have the latter recommending transliteration of Skt. *bimbisāra* using Tibetan script, while the former offers a literal translation of Tib. *gzugs can snying po*. The fact that Mo. *bimbisari*, a form originating from Skt. *bimbisāra*, can also be found in a Mongolian version of *Lalitavistara* produced in the Middle period and thus can be regarded as a genuine Uighur loanword, enables us to assume that Mo. *bimbasari* found in B is also a genuine Uighur loanword, and in fact we find this form in Uighur literature (Poppe 1967: 4).

Compared to Mo. *bimbasari*, Mo. *ruba garbi* is far more problematic. It is easy to assume that its original should be Skt. *rūpa-garbha*, becoming Uig. *ruba garbi*, after being transformed with intervocalic voiceless plosive and with the final vowel *-a* replaced with *-i*, before being borrowed by Mongolian. Indeed Middle Mongolian literature contains some compound words with *garbi* as the second part, thus reflecting original Sanskrit compounds; for example, Mo. *gsiti garbi*, an equivalent to Skt. *kṣiti-garbha* (the Bodhisattva Mahasattva Maha Pranidhana Paramita), is in fact used in this work. Thus, we might well be tempted to presume that Mo. *ruba garbi* is a loan from Uighur, of which the original is Skt. *rūpa-garbha*. However, contrary to such a presumption, the form simply does not appear in any work of Sanskrit literature and the Uighur form **ruba garbi*, the "missing link" as it were, has yet to be found in that literature. Thus, we can only

conclude that the Mongolian form is not a genuine Uighur loanword, but rather a psuedo-Uighurism.

When the unknown translator of Üker-ün aɣula, at the sight of *gzug zan snying po* in line 1-0012 of his Tibetan source, first fabricated a non-existent Sanskrit form *rūpa-garbha*, then transformed it into a seemingly Uighur form, he may have noticed that the Tibetan form was a proper noun. If he had been more cautious, he would have humbly translated it utilizing native Mongolian forms; for example, Mo. *dürsü-tü-yin ǰirüken*, which is found in the canonical version of *Mahāvyutpatti*, among others. Rather, he probably aspired to translate with air of Sanskrit and Uighur authenticity. His choice of *rupa-garha* itself was not so unreasonable, since versions of *Mahāvyutpatti* available at present indeed offer us many instances in which Tib. *gzugs can* is an accepted translation for Skt. *rūpa*, and also Tib. *snying po* acceptable for Skt. *garbha*. Although the now available *Mahāvyutpatti*s did not exist at the time of the translation in question, there were similar glossaries of Buddhist terms that must have been utilized by translators. Unfortunately, although each part did in fact exist, the compound, *rupa-garbha* never did; thus unveiling one anonymous monk's attempt to transform an imaginary Sanskrit compound into a Mongolian translation of a Tibetan source by pretending it was a genuine Uighur loanword.

The above is only one saga of one pseudo-Uighurism found in *Üker-ün aɣula*. The other works discussed in this article also have their own pseudo-Uighur mythology to reveal.[25] This type of wordplay reflects to some extent the linguistic situation which was forced upon monks ordered to translate Buddhist works into Mongolian during the Middle period. That is to say, given the reality that 1) Sanskrit was the languages in which Buddhist scripture was originally written and 2) Uighur was the language spoken by missionaries who introduced Buddhism, its terminology, as well as a writing system to the Mongols, both languages were deemed to be of very prestigious, presumably more than Tibetan. Therefore, the fabrication of Sanskrit-based pseudo-Uigurhisms also enable us to speculate on the degree to which Tibetan Buddhism was evaluated by the Mongols of the time. There is no denying that such a multi-linguistic moment is quite a special one, being extremely limited to the narrow field of Buddhist scripture. That being said, there is no doubt that we have here a clear example of language contact reflected in the development of a written language and is therefore of interest and value not only from a linguistic and philological viewpoint, but also from a historical one.

7. Conclusion

The facts presented in this article have convinced us of the heterogeneous nature or multilayered composition of Mongolian Buddhist works. On the one hand, we have excellent translations free from errors, such as Chos kyi 'od zer's *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, while on the other hand, there exist inferior efforts with glaring mistakes, such as the examples presented here. To what degree these latter translators were acquainted with their source languages and Buddhist ideas outside of Mongolian language and Buddhism discipline must have been considerably varied in both the eras of Middle and Modern Mongolian productions. Carelessness on the part of revisers attempting to span the two eras resulted in the creation of erroneous forms as well as the continuation of archaisms which ironically enhance the value of Mongolian Buddhist works for us historical linguists. Although we are prone to concentrate our attention on archeological findings or what appear to be the oldest manuscripts and thus undervalue Modern printings, such as the works of the Mongolian canons, when read in more detail, this latter genre will demonstrate equally interesting facts.

Notes

1) This study was funded by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science 2010−2012 (Grant Number: 22520435) and 2013−2015 (Grant Number: 25370482).
2) Here we follow the historical periodization of Mongolian proposed by Poppe (Poppe1955: 11−12): (I) Ancient Mongolian before the 13th century, (II) Middle Mongolian between the 13th century and the late 16th century, and (III) Modern Mongolian from the late 16th century to the present. The first period is none other than Proto-Mongolian, Mongolian before the introduction of a writing system, while the third includes living dialects spoken at present. Middle Mongolian is the intermediate stage between the two, and the number of related source materials is very limited, with some exceptions, such as *The Secret History of the Mongols*.
3) As for the citing convention adopted here, see Higuchi 1998: 21. The corresponding Tibetan source text is *rgyal po dang blon pol songs pa mi 'tshul khrims dang ldan pa dad pa cen dang yul chos dang 'thun par bgyid pa*.
4) More details about these forms and other archaic forms are contained in Higuchi 1998.
5) The corresponding Tibetan text is *ma la bdag la bu cig yod na sangs rgyas phal mo mo ches byin gyis brlabs pa 'i 'gnas der yul 'debs su gzhug go snyam du bsams nas...* The English translation is that of B.
6) The corresponding Tibetan lines are as follows: *mau dga lai bu la song pa nyan*

thos chen po stong nyis brgya lnga bcu dang.

7) The Chinese title is 佛說寶網經 (Taisho 433) and the Tibetan is *'Phags pa rin chen dra ba can gyis shus pa shes bya ba theg pa chen po 'i mdo* (Tohoku No.163 and Otani No. 830). The Mongolian version, as well as the Tibetan version, consists of 195 stanzas and prose but the Sanskrit version has 198 stanzas and the order of prose is also different from that of the former two. It is possible that the Sanskrit original on which the Tibetan version was dependent is different from the version from which the Chinese version was translated.

8) As to the Hedin Collection, see Aalto 1954: 81 and 85. More detailed information about PLB4 and PLB39 is given on Heissig 1954: 10 and 37. Concerning the canonical version, see Ligeti 1942−44: 244. The five texts have all the same Mongolian title, *Qutuγ-tu erdeni tour-tu-yin öčigsen neretü yeke kölgen sudur.* A detailed bibliographical description is presented in the first part of Higuchi 1994.

9) The manner of citation adopted here is the same as that in Higuchi 1994. See the introductory remarks of the second part of the monograph. Formal differences among B are not mentioned here. The English translation corresponds to the lines of A.

10) The corresponding Chinese is 若奉最勝號　夙夜具七日 彼眼到清淨　逮見無量佛.

11) The corresponding Chines is 不疑音聲句　疾逮得三昧 興暢億功德　聞佛名所致.

12) The corresponding Chinese is 其福興盛　具足千子　勇猛英雄　遊步無勝 面貌殊妙　相好飾姿　彼功德勳　如天帝王.

13) As to K767, see Ligeti 1942−44: 184−85, while PLB34 (*Eldeb bilig barmaid orosiba*) is referred to in Heissig 1954: 35. As to PLB13, 49, 67 and 72, see Heissig 1954: 44−47, 58, 61. K764 and PLB32, complete versions of *the 18,000-verse Perfect Wisdom,* are referred to in Ligeti 1942−44: 81 and Heissig 1954: 35.

14) Quite strangely both ways of divisions do not coincide with that of the Tibetan originals. As for the details of the number of verses and the divisions into chapters, see Higuchi 1991: 5−7.

15) The citing convention follows Higuchi 1998. The corresponding Tibetan and Sanskrit are

    Tib.
    (a) dpa' bo gar spyod shes rab pha rol phyin pa yis   (Mo. (a))
    (b) khams gsum yang dar 'das la rnam par grol bang mi   (Mo. (b))
    (c) nyon mongs bsal bal gyur kyang skye ba ston par byed   (Mo. (c))
    (d) rka dang nad dang 'chu ba med kyang 'chi 'pho ston   (Mo. (d))
    Skt.
    (a) trai-dhātukaṃ samatikrānta na bodhisattvāḥ   (Mo. (b))
    (b) kleśāpanīta upapatti nidarśayanti   (Mo. (c))
    (c) jara-vyādhi-mṛtyu-vigatāś cyuti darśayanti   (Mo. (d))
    (d) prajñā pāramitā yatra caranti dhīraḥ   (Mo. (a))

16) We have further evidence in the presence of *bügsen*, a perfect verbal nominal form of the copula *bü-* which also became defective in Modern Mongolian. However, in Middle Mongolian this verb could be more freely combined with various verbal suffixes, although *bügsen* has been found only nine times so far in the Middle Mongolian literature, including *The Secret History of the Mongols*, *Vajracchedikā* and *Bhadracarya*.

17) For more details, see Higuchi 1991: 25−26.

18) The corresponding Tibetan line is *de ltar spyod pa legs mtsho smra ba ʼi rnams*.

19) The corresponding Tibetan line is *de ltar spyod pa legs mtsho smra ba ʼi rnams*.

20) The reading of Text 27, the shorter leaf, should be partly corrected. See Higuchi 2014: 326−28.

21) As to PLB16, see Heissig 1954: 27−28, and as to H1058B, the only manuscript, see Aalto 1954: 67−103. K868 is referred to in Ligeti 1942−44 and PLB178 is mentioned Heissig 1954: 156. Regarding T22, see Poppe, Hurvitz and Okada 1964: 25−26. Another manuscript of this work is held in the Royal Library in Copenhagen, but is a dead copy of PLB16 (see HeissigBawden 1971: 218−19). T22 is noteworthy in that we find traces of rearrangement of the chapter order, as partly introduced in Section II of Higuchi 1996b. More details will be revealed in a future paper.

22) Version A is represented by PLB16, and the latter by K848.

23) The title is *Čaɣan linqua neretü degedü nom yeke kölgen sudur*. The titles given at the opening pages are slightly difference among five, but we will refer to the work as *Čaɣan lingqu-a* hereinafter.

24) This, however, does not mean that the Mongolian versions of *the Lotus Sūtra* available at present are valueless in terms of Mongolian historical linguistics. Version A provides us with an archaic form *bilge bilig* "perfect wisdom" discussed in the second section of this article, and we find in Version B a rarely found copula peculiar to Middle Mongolian, *bolui*, of which the innovative equivalent *bolai* was far more prevalent even in the Middle period. The presence of these forms in A and B is proof of ultimate Middle origin of the two. Since archaisms in both versions are not so remarkable as those in the older versions of the previously mentioned works, we can regard these two as being modernized more exhaustively than the others at the time publication in the 17th century or later. Left to be discussed is *büged-iyer* in the third line, which has survived the revisions in all three versions. This form is quite exceptional in that the gerundive suffix *-ged* is directly followed by the instrumental case suffix *-iyer*, although we do find many instances of it in Buddhist works, but no trace in the secular literature. This point has already been made in Section V of Higuchi 1996b and will be further discussed in a future paper.

25) For more details on pseudo-Uighurism, see Higuchi 1996b, 1996c and 1999.

References

Aalto, P. 1954. A Catalogue of the Hedin Collection of Mongolian Literature. pp. 67–108. *Contributions to Ethnography, Linguistics and History of Religion*. Reports from the Scientific Expedition to the North-Western Provinces of China under the Leadership of Dr. Sven Hedin: The Sino-Swedish Expedition 38 (VIII. Ethnography 6). Statens Etnografiska Museum, Stockholm.

Cerensodnom, D., and Taube M. 1993. *Die Mongolica der Berliner Turfansammlung*. Berliner Turfantexte XVI. Akademie Verlag, Berlin.

Chandra, L. 1982. *Early Buddhist Texts in Mongolian*, vol. 1. Śata-Piṭaka Series 300. Sharada Rani, New Delhi

Heissig, W. 1954. *Die Pekinger lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache: Materialien zur mongolischen Literaturgeschichte*. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden. (abbr. as PLB)

Heissig, W. 1962. *Beiträge zur Übersetzungsgeschichte des mongolischer buddhistischen Kanons*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Heissig, W. assisted by Bawden, C. 1971. *Catalogue of Mongol Books, Manuscripts and Xylographs*. The Royal Library, Copenhagen.

Higuchi, K. 1991. *The Mongolian* Ratnaguṇasaṁcayagāthā*, Introduction, Texts, Translations and Notes*. Keisuisha, Hiroshima. (in Japanese: 樋口康一『蒙古語譯『寶德藏般若經』の研究』溪水社)

Higuchi, K. 1994. *The Mongolian* Ratnajāliparipṛcchā*, Introduction, Texts, Translations and Notes*. Taga Press, Tokyo. (in Japanese: 樋口康一『蒙古語譯『寶網經』の研究』多賀出版)

Higuchi, K. 1996a. *Sartavaki badari*: A Pseudo-Sanskrit Form in the Mongolian *Ratnajāli*. pp. 11–25. *Eurasian Studies Yearbook* 68. Department of Central Eurasian Studies, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Higuchi, K. 1996b. Mongolian Versions of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* from the Linguistic and Philological Viewpoint. pp. 21–48. *Zentralasiatische Studien des Seminars für Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft Zentralasiens der Universität Bonn* 26. Otto Harrasowitz, Wiesbaden.

Higuchi, K. 1996c. *Üker-ün aγula* or Mongolian Versions of *Gośṛṅgavyākaraṇa*. pp. 159–174. *Proceedings of the 38th Permanent International Altaistic Conference: Kawasaki, Japan, August 7–12, 1995*. Otto Harrasowitz, Wiesbaden.

Higuchi, K. 1998. *Mongolian Versions of the* Gośṛṅgavyākaraṇa*, Introduction, Texts, Translations and Notes*. Benseisha, Tokyo. (in Japanese: 樋口康一『蒙古語譯『牛首山授記經』の研究』勉誠社)

Higuchi, K. 1999. Implications of Mistakes in Mongolian Buddhist Works. pp. 12–36. *Altai Hakpo: Journal of the Altaic Society of Korea* 9 (Memorial Volume for Retirement of Prof. Dr. Seong Baeg-in). The Altaic Society of Korea, Seoul.

Higuchi, K. 2012. Unknown Treasures Hidden in Lines of Mongolian Buddhist Literature: In the Case of Mongolian Versions of *the Lotus Sūtra*. pp. 139–153. *Altai Hakpo: Journal of the Altaic Society of Korea* 22. The Altaic Society of Korea, Seoul.

Higuchi, K. 2013a. Mongolian Versions of *the Lotus Sūtra*: Their Chronology and

Its Implications. pp. 13–27. *Synchronic and Diachronic Studies on Altaic Languages: Proceedings of the 11th Seoul International Altaistic Conference*. The Altaic Society of Korea, Seoul.

Higuchi, K. 2013b. Linguistic and Philological Value of Mongolian Buddhist Works. pp. 48–51. *Монгольские языки: история и современность*. Материалы международной научной конференции Санкт-Петербург, 21–23 октября 2013 г. Россицкая Академия Наук Институт Лингвистических Исследований, Санкт-Петербург.

Higuchi, K. 2014. How Were Mongolian Versions of *the Lotus Sutra* Translated, Compiled and Transmitted?: Through Examination of the Turfan Fragments. pp. 317–330. *Актуальные вопросы тюркологических исследований. Сборник статей к, 75-летию В. Г. Гузеаа*. Санкт-Петербургский Государственный Университет Восточный Факультет, Санкт-Петербург.

Ishihama, Y. and Fukuda, Y. 1989. *A New Critical Edition of* the Mahāvyutpatti*: Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology*. Toyo Bunko, Tokyo.

Kuribayashi, H. and Hailan. 2015. *A Study of the Mongolian Documents Involved in* Manwen yuan-dang*, Written in the Early 17th Century*. Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University, Sendai. (in Japanese: 栗林均・海蘭編 『『滿文原檔』所收モンゴル語文書の研究』 東北大學東北アジア研究センター)

Ligeti, L. 1942–44. *Catalogue du kanǰur mongol imprimé*. Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica III. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. (abbr. as K.)

Poppe, N. 1955. *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*. Suomalaris-Ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki.

Poppe, N., Hurvitz, L. and Okada, H., 1964. *Catalogue of the Manchu-Mongol Section of the Toyo Bunko*. Toyo Bunko, Tokyo.

Poppe, N. N., 1967. *The Twelve Deeds of Buddha: A Mongolian Version of* Lalitavistara*; Mongolian Texts, Notes, and English Translation*. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

Sárközi, A., in collaboration with Szerb, J. 1995. *A Buddhist Terminological Dictionary: The Mongolian* Mahāvyutpatti. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Shogaito, M. 1991. On Uighur elements in Buddhist Mongolian Text. pp. 27–49. *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 49. Toyo Bunko, Tokyo.

Suzuki, D. T. (ed.). 1961. *The Tibetan Tripiṭaka, Peking Edition: Kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto; Catalogue and Index*. Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, Tokyo-Kyoto. (in Japanese: 大谷大學監修；西藏大藏經研究會編 『影印北京版西藏大藏經：大谷大學圖書館藏；總目錄附索引』 西藏大藏經研究會) (abbr. as Otani)

Takakusu, J. and Watanabe, K. 1934. *A Catalogue of the Taisho Tripiṭaka*. Taisho Issaikyo Kankokai, Tokyo. (in Japanese: 高楠順次郎・渡邊海旭編 『大正新修大藏經總目錄』 大正一切經刊行會) (abbr. as Taisho)

Tohoku Imperial University (ed.). 1934. *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons: Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur*. Tohoku Imperial University, Sendai. (in Japanese: 東北帝國大學法文學部編 『西藏大藏經總目錄』 東北帝國大學法文學部) (abbr. as Tohoku)