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**Abstract:** The collection of the IOM, RAS contains a number of odd folios from the Mongolian Kanjur, the history of whose entry into the collection is unknown. The text is written in golden ink on blue paper. Handwriting and orthography are characteristic of the first half of the 17th c. Appearance and ductus reveal a striking similarity to the *Golden Kanjur* of Ligdan Khan kept in Hohhot. In the article the folios from IOM, RAS are compared with the *Golden Kanjur*. An attempt to trace back the history of these manuscript fragments leads to the conclusion that they could be among the first Mongolian manuscripts brought to St. Petersburg at the time of Peter the Great.
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The study of the genesis of the Kanjur (Mong. Ganjur), the Mongolian translation of the Word of Buddha (Skr. *buddhavacana*), is one of the key problems of modern Mongolian studies. Despite long-established interest in the problem, our vision of Buddhist canonical literature in Mongolia is far from complete, and new data in this field of study necessitate not so much a correction as a reconsideration of the whole picture.

The process of the Mongols’ reception of the *buddhavacana* started as early as the 13th–14th cc. under the Yuan dynasty. After the fall of the dynasty in 1368, translation activities among the Mongols declined for almost two centuries, recommencing with renewed vigour under Altan Khan (1508–
According to his biography, the “Jewel Translucent Sūtra” (Mong. Erdeni tummal neretü sudur), written sometime after 1607, and the colophon of the Daśasāhasrikā–prajñāpāramitā-sūtra, translated into Mongolian by Siregetü Güsi Corji (late 16th – early 17th cc.), the work of compiling the entire Kanjur was completed under Altan’s grandson Namudai Secen Khan (1586–1607). Unfortunately, not a single folio of this redaction has survived to the present day. The next manuscript edition of the Kanjur was produced under Ligdan Khan (r. 1592–1634) in the years 1628–29. Today it is well established that Ligdan Khan’s redaction committee made extensive use of the earlier translations, changing their colophons in favour of their patron. The final product of this translation and editorial work was a special manuscript written in gold on a blue background. Subsequently it was named the ‘Altan’, i.e. ‘Golden’, Kanjur.

In modern Mongolian studies it has been taken for granted that the Golden Kanjur was written in a single copy. However, the Mongolian historiographical tradition does not comment on the exact number of ‘golden’ copies. Thus, for example, the Mongolian chronicle called the “Thousand Spoke Golden Wheel” (Mong. Altan kürdün mingyän kegesüüti) states that “…the Kanjur was translated into Mongolian and written in gold”. Another Mongolian work, the “Golden Rosary” (Mong. Altan erike), reports: “It is marvellous that having written golden and silver letters that are like the Sun and the Moon on the sky of paper that is like blue turquoise they illuminated the darkness of ignorance of the sentient beings”. Later on this collection be-

---


6 In transcription of Mongolian text ‘c’ and ‘j’ are given without diacritic. The following symbols are used for the Galik letters and editorial marks: <…> — glosses and interpolations, {...} — eliminations and corrections of the text, a — ā, d—as — ṭ, d—as — ṭ, e—the, g—as — ṭ, j—as — ṭ, k—as — ṭ, m—as — ṭ, o—as — ṭ, t—as — ṭ, y—as — ṭ, z—as — ṭ.


8 Köké bidura metū dayasun-u oytaruyi–dur naran saran metū altan monggöö nüşügüd–ì orsiyulun qubitam amitan–u mongqar–un qarandūr–yi geyigūlün jokiyaysan yekke geyigülüs: NA-TA 1989, 114. Scholars have repeatedly commented on the five “black” or plain copies written at the same time as the Golden Kanjur (see, for example, ELSVERSKOG 2003, 211 n. 176; KOLLMAR–PAULENZ 2002, 159; USPENSKY 1997, 114), nevertheless the authors of this study are not acquainted with Mongolian historical records that mention them. At present we know the following ‘black’ manuscript copies of Ligdan Khan’s Kanjur: one volume preser-
came the basis for yet another edition of the Mongolian Kanjur — this time in blockprint — produced under the auspices of the Qing dynasty’s Emperor Kangxi (1654–1722) in 1718–20 in Beijing (MK). 9

**The Manuscript**

**of the Golden Kanjur Kept in Hohhot**

Twenty volumes, including fragments, of the Golgen Kanjur are in the library of the Academy of Social Sciences of Inner Mongolia (AK). The history, contents and colophon of this manuscript collection have been described in detail elsewhere. 10 For this study it is important to give the basic data on the codicology, paleography and orthography of the Golden Kanjur.

The Golden Kanjur consists of *pochti* format volumes; the size of the folios is 72×24.9 cm. The paper is multilayer Chinese: the inner layer is soft, white paper, while the upper layers (thinner and denser) have been painted blue. The text was written using a reed pen (calamus) with gold inside the blackened glossy interior of a frame (57.5×15.5 cm) outlined with a golden double line. Some minor inscriptions and graphic elements are written with silver. On the middle axis of each folio (excluding the first folios of the volumes) two double circles are drawn symbolizing the holes for the cords that used to bind some Indian palm-leaf manuscripts. 11 On the left side of the frame on the recto sides of the folios there is a ‘rail’ enclosing a marginal title denoting the section of the collection, the number of the volume marked with a Tibetan letter, and pagination in Mongolian. On the bulk of the folios hundreds in the pagination are indicated by small crosses: so, for example, the

---

9 The circumstances surrounding the creation of both Lijdan Khan’s and Kangxi’s editions have been repeatedly described in the literature on Mongolian studies. See, for example, Kasianenko 1993, 18–13; Heissig 1957; 1962; Tuyai-A, 2008, 278–297; Uspensky 1997, 113–114. The catalogue of the Kangxi’s edition see in Ligeti 1942. The full text of the blockprint Kanjur was edited by Lokesh Chandra (MK), at present a new edition of the Kangxi’s collection is being published in China under the guidance of Prof. Altanorgil.

10 Alekseev, Turanskaya 2013.

11 Alekseev, Turanskaya 2013, 760–761.
number of page 346 will be written as ‘+++docin jiru yan’.\textsuperscript{12} The first folios of the volumes are luxuriously decorated with illustrations of Buddhist deities accompanied by captions and praying formulas.\textsuperscript{13}

Although the 20 extant volumes of the Golden Kanjur demonstrate a variety of different handwriting styles, from calligraphic (especially on the first and the last folios of the volumes) to at times quite mediocre, all of them belong to the same ductus characteristic of the late 16th — early 17th cc. The initial ‘teeth’ do not have crowns, there are no diacritical marks for ‘n’ and ‘γ’ in front of the vowels, the texts do not make any distinction between the initial ‘j’ and ‘γ’, nor between ‘c’ and ‘j’ in the middle position. The medial ‘t’ and ‘d’ are sharpened and the lower element of the letter is not connected with the vertical axis. Besides they are often written in front of the vowels as a ‘loop’ with a ‘tooth’ (e.g. घ, घ). Final ‘a’, ‘e’ and ‘n’ are written in the form of a horizontal ‘tail’ that is turned down, as well as the long hanging ‘tails’ at the beginning or the ends of texts or when a scribe needs to fill in some excess space. The final ‘s’ is a short horizontal ‘tail’. The orkicas have ‘snake’s tongues’. The ‘sticks’ are almost of the same length as the ‘teeth’ and differ from the latter only in their shape and the angle of their inclination. To this, a minimal use of the Galik alphabet must be added.\textsuperscript{14}

The orthography of the manuscript also contains peculiarities characteristic of the late 16th and early 17th cc.:

— suffixes are often joined to words (Mong. cileger, sönögegcide, terigüber, basabar, aciban)
— preclassic use of ‘t’ and ‘d’ in suffixes (Mong. tala-tur, oron-teki, ulus-dayan, gerel-den)
— words can be written separately (Mong. es-e, ter-e, erdeni-sün)
— archaic spelling of such words as bodisung, lingua, etc.
— combination of ‘q’, ‘γ’ and ‘i’ (Mong. qiruka, hayag yiruut-a)
— characteristic use of ‘i’ at the beginning of Sanskrit and Tibetan words (e.g. irjudci for Tib. rgyud kyi, irgalbo for Tib. rgyal po, irgalmsan for Tib. rgyal mtshan, injan-a for Skt. jñāna).

\textsuperscript{12} Such a method of pagination is found in some early Tibetan translated texts such as the manuscripts of Prajñāpāramitā found in Dunhuang and Tabo (Scherrer-Schaub 1999, 21–22; Scherrer-Schaub, Bonani 2002, 194–195).
\textsuperscript{13} For more details see Alekseev, Turanskaya 2013, 761–762, 771–775.
\textsuperscript{14} Alekseev, Turanskaya 2013, 762.
“Golden” Folios
in European Collections

Several folios of Mongolian manuscripts written in gold on blue paper can be found in European collections. Two folios of this sort were published and described by Walther Heissig in his 1979 article titled “Die erste mongolische Handschrift in Deutschland”.\footnote{\textsc{Heissig} 1979.} One of them is kept at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, Saxony, together with a folio of a Tibetan manuscript and a document that casts light on its history.\footnote{\textsc{Heissig} 1979, 200–201.} The other folio is kept in the Swedish town of Linköping. It has been established that both folios were found in Siberia and came into the possession of their European owners in the early 1720s. The Wolfenbüttel folio was delivered to St. Petersburg from the ruined temple of Ablai Keyid on the river Irtysh. It came into possession of A.E. Stambke, the envoy of the Duke of Holstein at the court of Peter the Great, in 1723–24, and later became part of the collection of the German scholar J.F. Reimann.\footnote{\textsc{Heissig} 1979, 210.} The Linköping folio was brought to Sweden by the military officer Johan Gustaf Renat, who was sent to Siberia after the Battle of Poltava and spent 18 years (1716–1734) among the Dzungar people.\footnote{\textsc{Heissig} 1979, 210.} Both folios are identical to the Golden Kanjur in appearance, ductus and style of handwriting.\footnote{\textsc{Heissig} 1979, 210.}

The “Golden” Folios at the IOM, RAS

Odd folios and fragments (twelve complete folios and nine fragments) of the Mongolian Kanjur,\footnote{A.G. Sazykin in his catalogue gives a different number of folios: “17 odd folios and fragments of the manuscript Kanjur in Mongolian, written with “golden” ink on black lacquered paper” (Sazykin 2001, No. 2929). The same number is given on the folder that contains the folios. Most probably, this figure appeared because when calculating the quantity eight fragments were considered to be halves of complete folios.} the codicology, paleography and orthography of
which are strikingly similar to those of the Golden Kanjur from Hohhot and the folios published by W. Heissig, are kept in the collection of IOM, RAS under the pressmark K37 (IOMAK).

The size of the pothi format folios is about 63.7×22.8 (51×14.3) cm, 27–30 lines in the frame. Like the manuscripts described above, these Kanjur folios are written on multilayer Chinese paper: the inner layer is thinner and denser than in the Golden Kanjur in Hohhot, the upper layers are painted blue.

The text was written using a reed pen (calamus) with gold inside the blackened glossy interior of a frame outlined with a golden double line. On the middle axis of both sides of each folio two double circles are drawn with gold. On the left side of the frame on the recto sides of the folios there is a ‘rail’ enclosing the same markers as in the Golden Kanjur. Pagination is on the recto sides of the folios. On some folios, hundreds in the pagination are indicated with small crosses.

Most likely due to the limited amount of text, the handwriting seems to be more uniform than in the Golden Kanjur, but beyond all doubt it belongs to the same ductus. Absolutely all the peculiarities of the ductus of the Golden Kanjur listed above are characteristic of the folios kept in IOM.

The text on the ‘golden’ folios displays the same orthographical characteristics as the text of the Golden Kanjur, such as preclassic use of ‘t’ and ‘d’ in suffixes (Mong. oýtaryui-tur, veir-a-tur, etc.); separate writing of some words (Mong. ter-e); archaic spelling of such words as bodisung, maqasung etc.; combination of ‘q’, ‘γ’ and ‘i’ (Mong. qimusun, qi veir); characteristic use of ‘i’ at the beginning of Sanskrit and Tibetan words (Mong. irjudci, irgalmsan, injan-a). There is only one exception: we could not find any instances of suffixes being joined with words (possibly due to the limited amount of text material).

The folios belong to the Dandir-a, Yüm, Olangki and Vinai sections of the Mongolian Kanjur. Due to the absence of markers of works or chapters, the bulk of the fragments could not be identified. The exceptions are the fragments on folios 276 and 335 from the ka volume of the Dandir-a section.

F. 276a carries the end of the eighth work from the ka volume of Dandir-a section and the beginning of the ninth. To show correlation of the texts in AK, IOMAK and PK we collate the concluding title and the colophon of the

---

21 Precise sizes and numbers of lines for each folio are given below.
22 KASIANENKO 1993, No. 8.
23 KASIANENKO 1993, No. 9.
eighth work (Table 3), as well as the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Mongolian titles of the ninth work (Table 4).

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AK, Dandir-a, ka</th>
<th>IOMAK, Dandir-a, ka</th>
<th>PK, Dandir-a, ka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As can be seen from the textological collation, variant readings in this fragment are associated primarily with the rendering of foreign words. An interesting difference between the texts is the translation of the Tibetan expression “the king of all [types of] conceptual comprehension” (Tib. *rtog pa thams cad kyi rgyal po*). Here Tib. *rtog pa* is accurately and uniformly translated in both ‘golden’ copies (Mong. *onol*), while in PK there seems to be an error on the part of the scribe, who by force of habit wrote “the king of all teachings” (Mong. *qamuy nom-un qayan*), an expression that occurs abundantly in the texts of the Kanjur.

---

24 Q, rGyud, ka, 230a/2.
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AK, Dandir-a, ka, 342a</th>
<th>IOMAK, Dandir-a, ka, 276a</th>
<th>PK, Dandir-a, ka, 73a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qi vceir-a dandir-a raja nam-a::</td>
<td>qi vceir-a dandir-a raja nam-a::</td>
<td>hi baj’ar d’and’r-a ra-a c’a na-a m-a:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cii dorji se’s by’au-a irjudci irgalbo:</td>
<td>cii dorji se’s by’au-a irjudci irgalbo:</td>
<td>g’ye’ rdo’ rje: z’e’s by’au-a rgyud’ gyi rgyalpo’-i:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qi vceir-a neretü dandiras-un qayan:</td>
<td>qi vceir-a neretü dandiras-un qayan:</td>
<td>hi vceir neretü d’andiras-un qayan:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the textological collation demonstrates, the title of the work in three languages is absolutely identical in AK and IOMAK. Both manuscripts render Skt. hevajra as qi vceir-a, with the preclassic use of the ‘q’ and ‘i’ combination as well as the use of the same variant as in the Mongolian title vceir-a for Sanskr. vajra. Besides that, in the Sanskrit title in both manuscripts the long vowels are not marked. In the transcription of the Tibetan title Tib. kye’25 is rendered as cii, and ‘i’ is added to the transcriptions of Tib. rgyud kyi and rgyal po.26 PK demonstrates more accuracy in rendering the Sanskrit and Tibetan titles. It reproduces the long vowels of the Sanskrit title and uses more Galik letters to render Sanskrit and Tibetan words. On the whole AK and IOMAK demonstrate a more archaic manner of rendering Sanskrit and Tibetan words. The texts are absolutely identical, which suggests that the manuscripts are closely related. However, we do not have sufficient material to draw final conclusions about the relationship between the three manuscripts.

On f. 335a there is the marker of the seventh chapter of the work: degedii tabun rasiyan yarwsan vceir neretii samadi dolodayar bolsig bolai. This chapter is the part of the tenth work in the volume ka of the Dandir-a section.27

The History of the Golden Folios in the IOM, RAS

It is not known how these manuscript folios appeared in the Institute’s funds. The pressmark K37 was given to them in 1937, when the folios became part of the Mongolica Nova collection. This collection was formed

---

25 Q, rGyud, ka, 230a/3.
26 rGyud, ka, 230a/3.
27 KASIANENKO 1993, No. 10.
between 1925 and 1937\textsuperscript{28} and, besides the manuscripts and xylographs that arrived at the Institute during that period, it included some materials from the old funds, among which were the manuscript folios in question.\textsuperscript{29} Apart from the record in the inventory book dated 1937, no references have been found that could cast light on the history of these folios. It is possible that before 1937 they were never catalogued or inventoried.

There are reasons to believe that the odd ‘golden’ folios of the Mongolian Kanjur were among the first Mongolian and Tibetan manuscripts that were found at the ruins of Ablai Keyid and brought to St. Petersburg in the early 1720s by order of Peter the Great.\textsuperscript{30}

The manuscripts from Ablai Keyid are considered to have been the basis of the Mongolian collection of the Asiatic Museum, although so far it has not been established which particular manuscripts in the IOM’s collection these were.\textsuperscript{31} Some of them probably became part of the first collection of the Asiatic Museum: in the catalogue compiled in 1891, under the title of Section I “Books and manuscripts according to the 1789 catalogue by Jährig”, it is stated that some of the manuscripts listed there were donated by Johann Jährig himself, while others had already been kept at the Oriental Department of the Library of the Academy of Sciences.\textsuperscript{32} Johann Jährig (1747–1795) was the first scholar in St. Petersburg to master the Mongolian language and was thus able to assess the value of the manuscripts held at the Academy. On examining these Mongolian manuscripts, Jährig referred to them as ‘torn-out folios’ (Germ. \textit{ausgerissene Blätter}) that were worth preserving only because they had already been preserved.\textsuperscript{33} This important detail suggests that many of the Mongolian and Tibetan manuscripts brought to St. Petersburg in the early 1720s were not only damaged, but were in fact random fragments.

Another valuable mention of the manuscripts found at the ruins of Ablai Keyid comes from Peter Simon Pallas, who travelled around adjacent territo-
ries in the early 1770s. The naturalist himself did not visit the site of the monastery, but his assistant put together a detailed description of the place, published in the 1773 book *Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Russischen Reiches*. According to this description, among the ruins one could still find remnants of the manuscripts that had earlier been scattered in large numbers at the abandoned monastery. Some of the manuscripts were written in black on white paper, others — in silver and gold on gossiped black and blue paper. The ones that Pallas’s assistant brought to him were so damaged that they crumbled to dust under his fingers, and yet the silver and golden letters could still be seen. From this description it emerges that even fifty years after Ivan Likharev’s visit to the ruins of Ablai Keyid it was still possible to find manuscript folios written in silver on black and in gold on blue paper — folios that could possibly come from the same volumes as the 21 ff. in the Mongolica Nova collection, the two folios from the Herzog August Bibliothek, and the one taken to Sweden by the artillery officer J.G. Renat.

In 1779 Johann Bacmeister described the collection of the Academy in the following way: “Our library is rich in Tangut and Mongolian manuscripts. Some of them with golden, others with silver, and others with black letters. A part of these manuscripts was brought in 1720 from Siberia, where they were found at Ablai-keyid on the Irtysh...” Not only does this description establish the presence of such manuscripts in St. Petersburg in the 18th c., it also complements Pallas’s evidence concerning their appearance and indicates to their possible place of origin.

All these scattered facts help to reconstruct piece by piece the history of the manuscript folios under the pressmark K37. The design of the pages and the ductus, bearing unquestionable resemblance to the Golden Kanjur of Hohhot, show that the manuscript was written in South Mongolia in the first decades of the 17th c. The codicological similarity to the folios from Wolfenbüttel and Linköping is no less evident, revealing possible connections with Ablai Keyid. The assumption that these folios were once found at the ruins of a monastery is supported by their poor state, as well as by the fact that they come from different volumes of such a large collection of texts as the Kanjur. If they were in fact brought to St. Petersburg in the 1720s, their unsatisfactory condition could possibly be a good enough reason for Jährig not to include them in his collection. Thus the folios could have ended up being stored in the funds of the Academy of Sciences for two hundred years before they were finally listed as part of the collection Mongolica Nova in 1937.

34 Pallas 1773, 551.
35 Bacmeister 1796, 122.
Conclusion

A striking similarity between the ‘golden’ folios from IOM, RAS, the library of the Herzog August Bibliothek, Linköping and the Golden Kanjur from Huhhot indicates that most probably these manuscripts were written at the same time, as part of one and the same ‘project’. As at the moment we do not have any reason to doubt that the ‘golden’ manuscript collection kept in Huhhot is the Golden Kanjur of Ligdan Khan, we can assume that the other manuscript fragments were also written in 1629 after the translation and editing of the Mongolian Kanjur had been completed. At present it is not clear how some of these manuscripts came to be at Ablai Keyid. The possibility to solve this riddle lies in further study of the ‘golden’ fragments on blue paper preserved in European collections. For now, having given free rein to our imagination, we can only conjecture that because, under pressure from the Manchu, Ligdan Khan retreated to Kökenuur, where he died in 1634, and then in 1636–1637 that area was taken by the Khoshud under Güüsi Khan, some part of the holy books of the last all-Mongolian khan may have come into the Khoshud’s hands as trophies, as repeatedly happened in Mongolian history.

The Catalogue of the ‘Golden’ Folios in the IOM, RAS

Given below is the catalogue of the folios of the manuscript Kanjur kept in the IOM, RAS. The folios are listed according to the order of sections and folios in the Kanjur. The folios that have not been identified are given in the end of the list. The description of each folio includes: the section marker, the volume number, the folio number (including its Mongolian spelling), the sizes of the folio and the frame, the number of lines on both sides of the folio, the beginning and concluding lines of the folio. For the fragments without part of the text only the length of the folio and the beginning and concluding lines are indicated.

36 ALEKSEEV, TURANSKAYA 2013, 777.
37 Similar folios are kept in libraries in Berlin, Glasgow and London (HEISSIG 1998, 158).
38 IMNR 194; ATWOOD 2003, 335, 421.
39 In the transcription of the Mongolian text the following additional symbols are used: parentheses — to indicate the side of the folio and the number of the line (empty parentheses indicate the lines of a folio, the beginning of which is lost), asterisks — instead of words which are impossible to read, a question mark — for words, the reading of which is doubtful, three dots — to indicate a lost fragment of the text.
1. Dandir-a, ka, 164/194? (jayun jiran/yiren dörben?), 63.7×22.9 (51×14.3) cm, 28 and 29 lines
(a/1) ilekü singekü boluyad jici basa ene kemebesü tegüncilen ür-e-i (2) teyin büged ariyın boluyu: tere metü qoyar yurban naiman-iyar (3) ilekü-j singe-gegülkü boluyad jici basa singeküi ene kemebesü degedü (4) bida-nuyud-i-iyar: ese singgebësti ele amitan-tur kejiy-e naiman (5) söni boltala kürdün-ü odoqui sayitur boluyu: ...

... (b/25) mingyan toyat an nebtelkü jayun-iyar qubilgag (26) san jayun kiged költi: nebletekü-yi kejiyede ber medejü: (27) öbere öbere edür qonoq-un ca-y-tur idegedekü boluyad (28) cayan kiji qubi-aca ecüs-tür isgince-yin (40) qubi bolai: (29) sayin keyid kiged yajar-un ger küiten kei-lüge qalayun-aca

2. Dandir-a, ka, 276 (qoyar jayun dalan jirguyan), 63.6×22.8 (51.7×14.3) cm, 27 and 28 lines
(a/1) qoyin-a kümün-i nomoyadaqqu ca-y-tur: tedeger-i ber yambar (2) dege-dü jirgalang-tu bolqaqui-yin tulada: tere metü yeke (3) ayalqutu oczjü bür-ün: köbegün-lüge nigen-e qamuy burqad: (4) yeke vciy satu-a-yi nomlaysan-i ilete ma'atulai: qamuy (5) burqad-luy-a tegsi barılduyici d'agini yilvi jirgalang-un (6) degedü kemegdektü: nigen tümen naiman mingyat-aca qamuy onol-un (7) qayən nayan doloduşar tegüsbei: :: :: ...

... (b/25) vciy-a garbi ocir-un: (26) ai ilaju tegüs nögcigen-e: vciy-tu bey-e-tür kedün (27) sudal amui: ilaju tegus nögcigen jarliy bolur-un: sudal (28) kemebesü yucin qoyar bülgüe: yucin qoyar bodi sedkil

3. Dandir-a, ka, 335 (yurban jayun yucin tabun), 63.8×23.3 (51.4×14.5) cm, 28 and 28 lines
(a/1) bilig baramid-un belge bilig: egünü vciy-tu ***41 (2) kemen ügileyü: qamuy nom-ud-un oron: tegüncilen iregse (3) ayusi: burqan vciy-tu-yin büged: ary-a bilig kiged-i (4) kölgelegsed: qotala yurban yirtincüs-ün delekei kiged delekei(5)-yin door-a oytaryui-tur: cisun kiged sukir-a-bar (6) dügü-rügsen bey-e: ijayar-tan-u erketü egünü nomlar-un: ...


---

40 ? نیرا/41 AK, Dandir-a, ka, 405b: naran.
4. Yüm, ka, 56 (tabin jirğyan), the end of the folio is torn off, the length is 44 cm
(a/1) ilete tųyulong burcan bolųy-a inaru: qamųg ilaju tegü (2) nögcigsed-ün ülü anggijiraq bolųy: saradudi-yin köbegün: (3) mergen ary-a ügegi bodisung maqasung-nar ngedigüer diyan-tur (4) tegsi ayulu:...
(b/19) üçgüken ber ügei-yin törölki-tür ber (20) tegsi orolduyu: sedikkü ügei: sedikkü ügei busu-yin töröl(21)ki-tür ber tegsi oroldu-ayad tedeger mergen ary-a-tu(22)-yin tula ... -yin ba tegsi orolduqu-yin keber-...

5. Yüm, ka, 62/92? (jiran/yiren qoyar?), 63.5×23.4 (51.7×14.6) cm, 29 and 29 lines
(a/1) idegen umtayan-i olyayulqui ba: ebeciten-ü ebecin-i anaqaqi (2) ba: ireğü-tü <qarangyui> yau-tur aysad bügûde-yi bi ridi qubîljan(3)-iyar<iyan> ba bi kükün-iyer-iyen ali tayalaysebar bolıasuyai (4) kemen tayalaycid bodisung maqasung-nar bilig baramid -tur (5) suralcayaqdaqi: ...

6. Yüm, ka, 153 (+ tabin γurban), 63.5×22.8 (51.3×15.8) cm, 29 and 30 lines
(a/1) -γulumui: üiledkü bi qoqosun-a ülü barilduryulumui: qoqosun (2) ba üiledküy-e ülü barilduryulumui: medekü bi qoqosun-a ülü (3) barilduryulumui: <qoqosun ba> medekü bi {qoqosun-a} ülü barilduryulumui: ...
(b/26) duran-u medekü-yin iyayur ba qoqoson-a (27) ülü barilduryulumui: qoqosun ba duran-u medekü-yin (28) iyayur-a ülü barilduryulumui: *** *** (29) kemebsü saradudi-yin köbegün ene müttü *** *** qoqosun (30) bisîyal kemebsü: dedeđü bisîyal buyu: saradudi-yin

7. Yüm, ka, 240 (+ döcîn), 63.5×22.8 (51.3×15.8) cm, 29 and 30 lines
(a/1) burqan jarlıy bolur-un: subuti tégün-i yawun kemen sedki(2)mü: üiledkü-yi bodisung buyu kemen sedkümü-üü: öci(3)rü: ilaju tegü nögcigsen burqan teyimü buzu buyu: (4) ilaju tegü nögcigsen burqan jarlıy bolur-un:
(b/26) duran-u medekü-yin iyayur ba qoqosun-a (27) ülü barilduryulumui: qoqosun ba duran-u medekü-yin (28) iyayur-a ülü barilduryulumui: *** *** (29) kemebsü saradudi-yin köbegün ene müttü *** *** qoqosun (30) bisîyal kemebsü: dedeđü bisîyal buyu: saradudi-yin
8. Yüm, ka, 278 (++; dalan naiman), край листа оборван (52×14.6) cm, 29 and 30 lines
(a/1) kemekü ner-e anu bodisung bolğu qamı̄γ-a bui: duran-u tegüncilen (2) kü cinar busu busud anu bodisung bolğu ber qamı̄γ-a bui: ...
(b/28) ilaju tegüs nøgcigsen <burqan?> bodisung oğοɣ-a(29)ta ügei büged: üülü sedkidekü̈ ele bügesi: tegün-tür öngge(30)-yin ijarur-un tegüncilen kü cinar kemekü ner-e anu bodisung bolgu:

9. Yüm, ka.42 348 (+++ döcin naiman), the end of the folio with the part of the text is torn off, the length is 39 cm
(a/1) dayan ese üjegdebi: ilaju tegüs nøgcigsen burqan tere metü (2) nadur yeke asaraq ene nemekü ba: daki bayuraqü anu ese (3) sedkideged üneker dayan ese üjegdebesï ele: bodisung (4) kemen ken-i nereyidümü: ...
(b/10) ilaju tegüs nøgcigsen burqan edür öngge (11) ügei-yin dörben tegsi orolduqun-u nemekü̈ ba daki bayuraqü anu ese sedkiddebi: üneker dayan ese (12) üjegdebi: ilaju tegüs nøgcigsen burqan tere metü nadur (13) ügei-yan tegsi orolduqun-u nemekü̈ ba: taki (14) ...anu ese sedkideged: üneker dayan ese üjegde(15) ...disung kemen ken-i nereyidümü: ilaju tegüs nøgcigsen (16) ...tegsi urbaduqun-u tere (17) ...adistid (18) ...büged

10. Yüm, ka, 353 (+++ tabin γurban), 63.4×23.2 (51.8×15) cm, 30 and 31 lines
(a/1) buyu: qogosun büged duran bolai: öngge öngge ber (2) qogosun boluysan büged: öngge-yin qogosun anu ali (3) bügesi: tere ber öngge busu: öngge-ece öber-e (4) qogosun ügei: öngge büged qogosun buyu: ...
(b/25) cikin-ü qurayad <kürelcekü̈> cikin-ü (26) qurayad kürelcekü̈ ber qogosun boluysan büged: cikin-ü (27) qurayad kürelcekü̈ qogosun anu ali bügesi: tere ber (28) cikin-ü qurayad kürelcekü̈ busu cikin-ü qurayad kürelcekü̈(29)-ece öber-e qogosun ügei cikin-ü qurayad kürelcekü̈ (30) büged qogosun buyu: qogosun büged cikin-ü qurayad

11. Olangki, ka, 68/98? (jiraniyiren naiman?), the end of the folio with the part of the text is torn off, the length is 34.5 cm
(a/1) törogged: gerel egül-e iyer qamuuγ jüg bügüde-yi (2) dügürgeged: bodi modun-u aysan tngri-yin ayimay: (3) burqan-i nasuda üjeged takil üiledümü: eldeb (4) kujin-ü tũy badaracyi mani erdeni: kûji gerel utuqui (5) kûji nasuda yaruyad: dalai metü nokod bügüde-te (6) sayın ünün tügemel: tere metü modun-u qayán jüg(7)-tûr üjeskü̈leng-tü bolai: ...

42 The marker of the volume is not clear.
... (b/12) dalai metü sansar-tur bodi yabudal-iyar yabuquii (13) çay-tayan: bisirel-ln mandal iriger oyyata aril (13) ... oron kiged oron busu kucun bügüde sedkil-tür (14) ... sayibar odur sans-i kucun bügüde mayad (15) ... qutur gå dalai metü...

12. Olangki, ka, 211 (qoyar jayun arban nigen), the end of the folio with the part of the text is torn off, the length is 46.3 cm
(a/l) dayan kiciyegi kemegdeyü: degedü nidün kemegdeyü: jüg-i (2) geyigülükci kemegdeyü: ai ilayarysad-un köbegüd-e: tere metü (3) tedeger terigütü bürükü tegüsüysen yirtincü-yin ulus-tur (4) qutur-tanu ünen- nübü-d-ln ner-e inu <döcin> jayun mingyan költi toyatun (5) buyu: ...
... (b/19) ai ilayarysad-un (20) köbegüd-e: ken jobalan-i qamur Yapı törögülükci (21) qutur-tan-u ünen kemegdük tegin-tür tuyurysan arily gaçi (22) yirtincü-yin ulus-tur taciyangyü kemegdeyü: ügulektü

13. Vinay-a, ka, 216 (++ arban jirýuyan), 63.6x23 (51x14.2) cm, 28 and 29 lines
(a/l) ayysad döttüger ba: irejü sayargad jokistu bolbasu: (2) teden-i eyin kemen sedkigdektü: ked ber ese iregsen ayag (3)-qa tegimlig bui bolai kemen ulü sedkiged: nom-i sedkikü (4)-läge jokistay-a sedkigci tedeger jalbarin öcejü: ...
... (b/26) tede nøkod ese bosurad: ayag-qa tegimlig (27) odurysan tegün-ü qoyina <genede> iregsed saca ayag-qa tegimlig (28) saca qantu irebesü: tedeger-ün mandal-tur uriju? bür (29)-ün: tejigen arilyaquii üiledüged: anggida anggida tonilýaçi

14. Vinay, ka, 284 (++ nayan dörben), 63.5x22.8 (48.7x14.3) cm, 26 and 27 lines
(a/l) vinai busu-tur vinai kemen: vinai-tur vinai busu kemen üjigülkü (2) bolbasu tere metü üjigüegci-tür tokiyalduryuluyad ünen-iyer (3) tokiyalduryulju adqay negektü üilededkü:
...
(b/22) ecüs (23)-tür kürtele busu kedber ecüs-ün tula bügesü nögoje ber busu (24) ba: ecüs kürtele busu ba: kedber stür üiledügsen bügesü (25) eür üiledügsen-ü tula busu ba: kedber edür üiledügsen (26) bügesü söni üiledügsen busu: kedber mör tüğürigsen-tür (27) üiledügsen bügesü mör-tür üiledügsen busu:

15. Vinay-a, ka, 449 (+++ döcin yisin), 64x23.1 (51.3x13.7) cm, 28 and 29 lines
(a/l) nom-luy-a adalig-iyar qariyulun cidamui: kemen sedkibesü ele (2) tere- nuyud ba ulü ügülen: biraman-u köbegün yekerkemsg (3)-tü ene sitüen-tür
adali nom-l uy-a adali-bar qarýula(4) birmannuyudta ker ba eyin kemen sedkiy business ... 
 (b/25) tendece ÿar-tayan vcur-un jibqlang bidadeyissan (26) *** qamuy-a sayituru badarayci-tur nigen yal-un ocí (27) bolÝayad badarabai: biraman-u köbeyin yekremisig-tü terigun(28) degen barayad ker be biraman-u köbeyin yekremisig-tü-tur (29) ilaju tegüş nögeçisgén ýurban-da boltala asay-un ügülegsen

16. ? (margin. of the section is not clear, adii?), ka, 89 (nayan yisun), 64x23.2 (51.3x14.5) cm, 29 and 30 lines
(a/1) teyder gen kemebeschü ene metü nom-i abqui-yin tulada amín bey-e-yi (2) ber oyoyata tebcijü bür-ün: ene sudur-tur oroqu boluyu: (3) tegün-tür qoyitu çay inu alimad amitan bal ene metü nom-i (4) sonosqui-yin tulada kiciyegcä teyder ber: cuqay bolbasu (5) ele: üsüg-tür jiriqui: ungisiqü: jegküü: amabar uriqu (6) busud-tur delgerenggiy-ë üügülkü kiged-i-taki yarun (7) ügületele: alimad ene norn-ün jüli-i nemeqülüged: ...
... (b/22) tegünçilen ireqsen kemebeschü yambar-iyar jobalang-un (23) udq-a-yl üügülgüçü tegünçilen kü: alijias-un udq-a (24) kiged: taciyangyui-aca angijirayisan-ü udq-a-yl üügülbëi: (25) tegünçilen ireqsen kemebeschü yambar nirvan boluyan inu (26) amurliyasan bolai kemen üügülgüçü tegünçilen kü: qamuy çöç(27)cas-i mayad tebcikü udq-a-yl üügüluged: môngke busu (28) jobalang: bi üägei: nirvan kiged-ün qayalay-a-aca: (29) oyoyata ariluyan nom-un qayalay-a-yi ber üügülyüy: (30) kijayar üägei jokiyayci-a: tegünçilen ireqsed

17. ?, the beginning of the folio with the part of the text is torn off, the length is 42.1 cm
(a)... üilededkü... () duradqaydaqu: jorín... () -da nom-un qurum-i üiledikü lam-a burqan... () ber bаяsqaqaydaqu: lam-a-tur-iyan ***-i oggyn öciged: () tegünü qoyina qamuy çiyulysad-tur bolai: ...
... (b) lam-a-yn següder () qatun kiged qugy-un debsiger kiged oron-i: ali ba () yeke mungqay-ud alqbasu ele: te re narín büged kirqaqui () barıçi buyu: sayitar abisig ögedegsen ali tere

18. ?, the beginning of the folio with the part of the text is torn off, the length is 40.8 cm
(a) kiciyengätü baramid-iyar masida arbjjimu: () diyan baramid-iyar masida arbjjimu: bilig () baramid-iyar masida arbjjimu: bodisung gem üguegy-ë () üneker oroqu boluyu: 
...(b) ilaju tegüs nögeçisgén burqan jarlıy bolun-un: subuti () tegün-i yarun kemen sedkimü: öngge üägei nigen-i () bodisung buyu: kemen sedkimü-üü:
öcir-үн ( ) ilaju tegüs nögcigsen burqan teyin busu buyu: ilaju tegüs nögcigsen burqan jarlıy bolur-un: subuti tegün-i yayun kemen sedkimü:

19. ?, the beginning of the folio with the part of the text is torn off, the length is 54 cm
(a)... kei orosiqui:( ügei: moqor... ... idlaydaqui (=adistidlavydaqui) ügei: () buyu: tere... -u tula kemebesü: tere nere anu ügei () büged: tegüber tere nere anu orosiqui ügei: moqordaqui () ügei: adistidlavydaqui ügei bolai:: ... 
...(b) üneker dayan () ese üjegdebei: ilaju tegüs nögcigsen burqan tere metü () nadur boda ügei qoyosun-u... ba: daki baryanaqui anu ese sedkigdeged üneker dayan ese üjegdebesü ele:

20. ?, the beginning of the folio with the part of the text is torn off, the length is 56.7 cm
(a) -sung maqasung ilaju tegüs nögcigsen ()... -rûysan üneker tuylûysan yasalang ()... coy-tu kemegdekü burqan-a eyn kemen ocibe: ilaju tegüs () nögcigsen burqan bi ber tere sablokadatu yirtincü-yin oron()-taki ilaju tegüs nögcigsen tegünçilen iregsen dayini darûysan () üneker toyołuysan tere sakî'amuni burqan-i üjer-e ba: () tegün-tür mörgüjü ergün kündüler-e ba: tendeki tedeğer () bodisung maqasung-nar ber olangki anu jalâyu büged: ... 
...(b) tende tegünçilen iregsen dayini darûysan üneker tuylûysan sakî'amuni burqan kemegdekü sayun amidurayulun tedkü aju: () tere bodisung maqasung-nar-tur bilig-ün cinadu kürügüsen-i

21. ?, the beginning of the folio with the part of the text is torn off, the length is 39 cm
(a) burqan öngge ügei yin... () nereber orosiqui ügei... () ...<laydaqui buyu: tere yayun-u tula kemebesü ...-dekü ber tere nere anu orosiqui ügei...>
-laydaqui ügei bolai:: ilaju tegüs nögcigsen burqan... () burqan-i dayan duradqui-yin nemekü ba: taki... ese () sedkigdebei: ... 
...(b) tere yayun-u tula kemebesü: tere nere anu ügei () büged: tegüber tere nere anu orosiqui ügei: moqordaqui () ügei: adistidlavydaqui ügei bolai:: ilaju tegüs
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