
Kirill Alekseev,
Natalia Yampolskaya

**On the Fragment of the *Naran-u Gerel*
Catalogue Preserved in IOM, RAS¹**

Abstract: Until recently the manuscript entitled *Naran-u Gerel* in the collection of St. Petersburg State University was considered to be the only extant catalogue of the 17th c. recension of the Mongolian Kanjur. The article presents a fragment of the Kanjur catalogue discovered among the manuscript fragments from Dzungaria preserved in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences. Its textual similarity to the *Naran-u Gerel* and structural proximity to the manuscript copies of the Mongolian Kanjur indicate that having been reflected in more than one catalogue the repertoire and structure of the 17th c. recension were not that random as it was previously represented in Mongolian studies.

Key words: Mongolian Kanjur, catalogue, Dzungaria, manuscript collection of IOM, RAS.

The oldest extant recension of the Mongolian Kanjur (a voluminous compendium of translated texts ascribed to the Buddha) was implemented in 1628–1629 under the auspices of Ligdan-qayan of Čaqar (1592–1634). It has survived to the present day in a number of copies,² of which only the manuscript preserved in St. Petersburg State University Library (PK) represents the complete Kanjur set. The Kanjur catalogue called *Naran-u Gerel*, i.e. the *Sun-*

© Natalia Yampolskaya, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences

© Kirill Alekseev, Associate Professor, St. Petersburg State University

¹ The article was prepared within the frames of the academic project supported by RFBR (Russian Foundation for Basic Research, No. 18-012-00376): “*Golden*” manuscript fragments from Dzungar monasteries — a unique source of information on the history of the Buddhist canon in Mongolia: a comprehensive historical-philological study.

² See the description of the extant copies of the Mongolian manuscript Kanjur in ALEKSEEV 2015, 202–209.

light, is attached to the initial volume of PK [NG(PK)]. The text of the catalogue was published by Z.K. Kas'ianenko in 1987.³ Her analysis of the catalogue demonstrated that its structure and content are different from both PK and the xylographic edition of the Mongolian Kanjur from 1717–1720 (MK), but closer to PK. At that stage of study its text was considered to exist in a single copy and represent one of the preliminary drafts of Ligdan's recension.⁴

In his 2015 publication K. Alekseev already noted that NG(PK) was more likely regarded by its compilers as the PK catalogue and its deviations from the structure of the latter can be explained by its close connection to the catalogue of the Tibetan Kanjur block-printed in 1606 under the Emperor Wanli (1563–1620) and the general attitude to cataloguing at the time of its creation.⁵

The situation could be clarified by discovery of some other inventories of that kind. In 2013 another Kanjur catalogue was disclosed in the miscellanea called *Ganjur: Orosil-un Boti*. The publication represents the text that used to be kept in the Library of the Academy of Social Sciences of Inner Mongolia, but at present seems to be lost [NG(HH)].⁶ The manuscript format is a *debter* (a stitched fascicle) sized 26.3×26.3 cm, 36 pages, the text is written with a brush. On the cover of the fascicle there is an inscription: *the catalogue of the Precious Kanjur, debter one* (Mong. *Ganjuur erdeni-yin yarcaiy nigen debter*). On the last page of the manuscript there is an inscription indicating that it was copied in the 30th year of the Emperor Guangxu (Mong. *Badarayul-tu törö*, r. 1875–1908), which corresponds with the year 1904 of the European calendar. The publishers of the catalogue identify the text as a copy of the catalogue of the so-called Ligdan-qayan's Golden Kanjur.⁷ They also mention that the NG(HH) text is incomplete without going into any further details, and note that in their publication they corrected “some mistakes” of the text.⁸ The text of NG(HH) has the same title,⁹ foreword and basically

³ KAS'IANENKO 1987.

⁴ KAS'IANENKO 1987, 164–167; 1993, 10; KOLLMAR-PAULENZ 2002, 160.

⁵ ALEKSEEV 2015, 216–221. PK(NG) is not the only example of a catalogue that does not fully correspond with the manuscript it belongs to. In both the Tibetan and Mongolian literary traditions even the small lists could conflict with the repertoire and arrangement of the texts represented by them. Thus, for example, according to H. Tauscher, the volume *dkar chags* of the Gondhla proto-Kanjur show some deviations from the respective volumes, as they probably were mechanically reproduced from the model that was copied. TAUSCHER 2008, xlv.

⁶ See the information about its storage in YG, vol. 1. No. 05111.

⁷ On the Golden Kanjur see ALEKSEEV and TURANSKAYA 2013.

⁸ See the description of NG(HH), the details of its publication and the catalogue itself in ERDENIČILAYU, ŠONGQOR 2013, 17–18, 172–207.

⁹ Mong. *Sayibar odurşan-u jarliḡ nom erdeni-yin toy-a: šasin-[i] delgeregüligci naran-u gerel neretii*: Cf. KAS'IANENKO 1987, 170.

the same structure as NG(PK) that allows to identify it as a version of the same catalogue. Nevertheless, the Hohhot catalogue reveals some structural deviations from NG(PK) that do not let us recognize two texts as absolutely identical. Regrettably, the way NG(HH) was published makes it unclear if these deviations were inherent in the original of the catalogue, or they rather belong to the incomplete 1904 copy, or even to its 2013 publication.

Recently a folio of the catalogue of the Mongolian Kanjur was found amongst the manuscript fragments from Dzungaria rediscovered by N. Yampolskaya in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences (IOM, RAS).¹⁰ The folio belongs to the Kanjur set designated by N. Yampolskaya as “Manuscript I” (JBF1). As the rest of JBF1 the fragment of the catalogue (NG(JBF1)) is a *poṭhi* format folio with the dimensions 23.2×63.8 cm (the frame, outlined with the red double line — 57.8×17.8 cm), 29 lines on each side of the folio. A signature in Tibetan — *k+zha* (ཀ་ཟ་) and the foliation number in Mongolian — *arban doloyan* (17) are written in the left-hand margin of the *recto* side of the folio outside the frame. Interestingly, this peculiar kind of signature that consists of two letters, one atop the other, seems to be characteristic of some old Tibetan manuscripts, such as those from Dunhuang and Ta pho. The meaning of such signatures is not absolutely clear yet. Scholars lean towards the idea that this is a method of foliation (defined as “type III” by C. Scherrer-Schaub and G. Bonani) in which the upper letter is the volume signature while the subscript one denotes hundreds in the foliation.¹¹ In the case with the single extant NG(JBF1) folio the meaning of the signature is even more ambiguous. Judging by the complete NG(PK) catalogue, which occupies only 11 folios, NG(JBF1) definitely could not exceed 100 folios.¹² Along with that, it is not possible to check if the other NG(JBF1) folios were marked with the same combination of letters or had some other signatures. It is very probable that the signature on the folio was mechanically copied from some Tibetan text, which indicates the possible archaic character of the Tibetan original of the *Naran-u gerel* catalogue.

The NG(JBF1) fragment is written with a *calamus*. The handwriting is of a quite mediocre quality and characterized by the following features:

¹⁰ On the so called black fragments of the Mongolian Kanjurs from Dzungaria see IAMPOL'SKAIA 2015.

¹¹ For more details on such a method of foliation in Tibetan manuscripts see SCHERRER-SCHAUB, BONANI 2002, 197; STEINKELLNER 1994, 125–128.

¹² Fol. 17 of NG(JBF1) corresponds with the fragment on Fols. 8v–9v of NG(PK), which means that one NG(PK) folio is the equivalent of about 1.8 NG(JBF1) folios. So the whole NG(JBF1) catalogue could occupy only about 19–20 ff.

- the width of the vertical and horizontal lines of the graphemes is the same;
- the initial “teeth” do not have “crests”;
- the “loops” are small, sitting on the axis;
- in many cases the “sticks” are of virtually the same length as the “teeth” and differ from the latter only in their shape and the angle of inclination;
- the long and slanting downwards “tails” begin with a sort of angle, when the line first goes to the left from the vertical axis and then forms the “tail”;
- the initial “s” and “q” are almost indistinguishable from each other;
- the initial “t/d” has a shape of a drop with a small “tooth”;
- the medial “t/d” has the form of a short “loop”;
- the final “k/g” and “ng” have “snake’s tongues” while the *orkica* does not have this element.

The fragment is not free from some corrections made with a thinner *calamus*.

Fol. 17 of NG(JBF1) represents the structure of the Vols. *na*, *pa*, *pha*, *ba*, and *ma* of the *Eldeb* section and corresponds with the fragment occupying thirteen lines on Fol. 8v, Fol. 9r and twelve lines on Fol. 9v of NG(PK). Below the transcription of the NG(JBF1) fragment is given together with a text critical word-by-word collation with NG(PK).¹³

[17r] @ [1] ^(NA1) sudur-aca arban jüg-ün bodisung-nar dalai ciyuluysan-u yeke bayasqulang-[2]un qa<u>rim-tur¹⁴ nayadıyci {ya} neretü¹⁵ yeke kölgen sudur: ^(NA2) anavatabta neretü¹⁶ [3] luuṣ-un qaṣan-u öcigsen neretü¹⁷ sudur: ^(NA3) qutuṣ-tu sambay-a oyutu-yin¹⁸ [4] öcigsen neretü¹⁹ sudur: ^(NA4) qutuṣ-tu

¹³ In this publication the following symbols are used for the *Galik* letters, orthographical peculiarities and editorial marks: <...> — glosses and interpolations, {...} — eliminations and corrections of the text, * — unclear readings (a number of the asterisks corresponds with the presumable number of letters in a word), superlinear / ... / — a fragment of text collated as a whole, superlinear letter and figures, e.g. NA1 — volume signature and the number of a work in the volume; e' — ε, d" — ε, ṅ — “n” with the diacritical dot, p' — ε, ṣ — final “s” written with the Uyğur sign for “z” (a short horizontal “tail”, t — a combination of the “loop” and the “tooth” to denote the medial “t/d” in front of a vowel; @ — *orkica*. In the transcription the Mongolian č and ĵ are given without diacritical marks.

¹⁴ NG(PK): qaurim-tur.

¹⁵ NG(PK): neretü.

¹⁶ NG(PK): neretü.

¹⁷ NG(PK): neretü.

¹⁸ NG(PK): oyitu-yin (sic). Correct *oyutu* = Tib. *blo gros*.

¹⁹ NG(PK): neretü.

yeke²⁰ tonilyayci neretü²¹ yeke kölgen [5] sudur: ^(NA5) qutuy-tu bodisung-nar-un²² yabudal-i uqayuluysan neretü²³ sudur [6] bui:: : :: arban yurbaduyar²⁴ pa²⁵ gelmeli-tür: ^(PA1) bilig-ün cinatu²⁶ [7] kijayar-a kürügsen: oytauluycu²⁷ vcir ^(PA2) qutuy-tu subikiranta²⁸ [8] vikiram-i-yin²⁹ bilig baramid bilig-ün cinatu³⁰ kijayar-a kürügsen [9] ^(PA3) jayun tabin yosutu: ^(PA4) <bilig-ün cinadu qijayara kürügsen tabitu:>³¹ ^(PA5) bilig-ün cinatu kijayar-a kürügsen ³² cügüken³³ [10] üsüg-tü: ^(PA6) bilig-ün cinatu³⁴ kijayar-a kürügsen kausika: ^(PA7) bilig-ün [11] cinatu³⁵ kijayar-a kürügsen {jarim jayun-tu;} qorin tabun qayaly-a-[12]tu: ^(PA8) bilig-ün cinatu³⁶ kijayar-a kürügsen jarim jayun-tu³⁷: ^(PA9) /bilig-ün [13] cinatu³⁸ kijayar-a kürügsen tabun jayun-tu:³⁹ ^(PA10) bilig-ün cinatu⁴⁰ kijayar-a [14] kürügsen jayun naiman ner-e: ^(PA11) yeke nigülesküi-yin cayan linqu-a-yin⁴¹ [15] neretü⁴² sudur ^(PA12) balyasun-u idesi neretü⁴³ <yeke>⁴⁴ sudur: ^(PA13) qutuy-tu esru-a-yin /coy-[16]*****/⁴⁵ yjung****d⁴⁶ öggügsen⁴⁷ neretü⁴⁸ sudur: ^(PA14) qutuy-tu dibangyar-a⁴⁹

²⁰ NG(PK): yeke-de.

²¹ NG(PK): neretü.

²² NG(PK): *add.* {d'alai ciyuluysan-u yeke bayasqulang-un qurim-tur nayaduyci neretü yeke kölgen}.

²³ NG(PK): neretü.

²⁴ NG(PK): yutayar.

²⁵ In Tibetan. NG(PK): *add.* pa (in Mongolian).

²⁶ NG(PK): cinadu.

²⁷ Sic. NG(PK): oytauluyci.

²⁸ NG(PK): subaranta.

²⁹ NG(PK): vikaramin.

³⁰ NG(PK): cinadu.

³¹ With a different hand and thinner *calamus*.

³² NG(PK): /bilig-ün cinadu kijayar-a kürügsen <tabin-tu: bilig-ün cinadu kijayar-a kürügsen>/.

³³ NG(PK): cügüken.

³⁴ NG(PK): cinadu.

³⁵ NG(PK): cinadu.

³⁶ NG(PK): cinadu.

³⁷ NG(PK): jayu-tu.

³⁸ NG(PK): cinadu.

³⁹ NG(PK): /abs./.

⁴⁰ NG(PK): cinadu.

⁴¹ NG(PK): linqu-a.

⁴² NG(PK): neretü.

⁴³ NG(PK): neretü.

⁴⁴ With a different hand and thinner *calamus*. NG(PK): *abs.*

⁴⁵ NG(PK): coytu-da.

⁴⁶ NG(PK): yivanggirid.

⁴⁷ NG(PK): ögtegsen.

⁴⁸ NG(PK): neretü.

⁴⁹ NG(PK): dibanggar-a.

burqan-a⁵⁰ [17] yivanggirid ögtegsen neretü⁵¹ sudur: ^(PA15) /saran-u genel-tü/⁵²
 qayan-u domoγ-i [18] ügüleküi: ^(PA16) j*****s-un⁵³ adalidqaqui sudur:
^(PA17) qotala-aca⁵⁴ buyan-tu neretü⁵⁵ [19] ****gün-ü⁵⁶ sudur ^(PA18) siltayan-aca
 barilduju⁵⁷ boluγsan uridu kiged ilγal-i [20] uqayulqui neretü⁵⁸ sudur ede
 bui:: : :: arban dörbedüger⁵⁹ pha⁶⁰ [21] {gemle} gelmeli-tür: ^(PHA1) qutuy-tu
 qarın ülü nicuγci kürdün neretü⁶¹ yeke [22] kölgén sudur: ^(PHA2) jayan-u⁶²
 neretü⁶³ yeke kölgén sudur: ^(PHA3) qutuy-tu [23] rasiyan neretü⁶⁴ yeke kölgén
 sudur: ^(PHA4) qutuy-tu mayidari-yin ****sen⁶⁵ [24] naiman nom-tu{*}
 neretü⁶⁶ yeke kölgén sudur: ^(PHA5) qutuy-tu tegüncilen iregsen-ü [25] jirüken
 neretü⁶⁷ yeke kölgén sudur: ^(PHA6) qutuy-tu erdini⁶⁸ qamuγ ceceg delgeregsen
 [26] neretü⁶⁹ yeke kölgén sudur: ^(PHA7) dabqucaγuluγsan ger-ün sudur:
^(PHA8) qutuy-tu [27] qubilγan qatuytai-tur yivanggirid⁷⁰ öggügsen⁷¹ neretü⁷²
 yeke {kölen} [28] kölgén sudur: ^(PHA9) qutuy-tu nom-un mudur neretü⁷³ yeke
 kölgén sudur: [29] ^(PHA10) qatuy-tu⁷⁴ yeke dayun neretü⁷⁵ yeke kölgén sudur:
^(PHA11) qutuy-tu bodi jüg-i [17v1] uqayuluγsan neretü⁷⁶ yeke kölgén sudur:
^(PHA12) qutuy-tu manjusiri-yin uqayuluγsan [2] neretü⁷⁷ yeke kölgén sudur:

⁵⁰ NG(PK): burqan-i.

⁵¹ NG(PK): neretü.

⁵² NG(PK): /saran neretü/.

⁵³ NG(PK): jalaγus-un.

⁵⁴ NG(PK): qotala-aca.

⁵⁵ NG(PK): neretü.

⁵⁶ NG(PK): köbegün-ü.

⁵⁷ NG(PK): barilduqui.

⁵⁸ NG(PK): neretü.

⁵⁹ NG(PK): dötüger.

⁶⁰ In Tibetan. NG(PK): p'a.

⁶¹ NG(PK): neretü.

⁶² NG(PK): *add.* {****} <kücün>.

⁶³ NG(PK): neretü.

⁶⁴ NG(PK): neretü.

⁶⁵ NG(PK): öcigsen.

⁶⁶ NG(PK): neretü.

⁶⁷ NG(PK): neretü.

⁶⁸ NG(PK): erdeni.

⁶⁹ NG(PK): neretü.

⁷⁰ NG(PK): yivanggirid.

⁷¹ NG(PK): ö<g>gügsen.

⁷² NG(PK): neretü.

⁷³ NG(PK): neretü.

⁷⁴ Sic. NG(PK): qutuy-tu.

⁷⁵ NG(PK): neretü.

⁷⁶ NG(PK): neretü.

⁷⁷ NG(PK): neretü.

(PHA13) qutuy-tu sayin öglige ögküi (PHA14) degeṭü⁷⁸ yabudal [3] irüger:
 (PHA15) qutuy-tu tngri-yin köbegün ülemji kücüṭü⁷⁹ sedkil-iyer öcigsen [4]
 neretü⁸⁰ yeke kölgen sudur ede bui:: : :: arban tabtayar ba⁸¹ [5] gelmeli-tür:
 (BA1) qutuy-tu luus-un qaṭan sagir-a-yin⁸² öcigsen neretü⁸³ [6] yeke kölgen
 sudur: (BA2) qutuy-tu erdini-yin⁸⁴ {kijay} kijayar neretü⁸⁵ sudur: [7]
 (BA3) qutay-tu⁸⁶ burqaṅ-i ülü tebciküi neretü⁸⁷ sudur: (BA4) qutuy-{tu}-tu [8]
 manjusiri⁸⁸ orosiṭsan neretü⁸⁹ sudur: (BA5) qutuy-tu salu tuturyan-u uy [9]
 noṭoyan-u⁹⁰ neretü⁹¹ sudur: (BA6) tabun aldal-un buyan kiged buyan busu-yin
 aci [10] ür-e-yi onoyṭsan sudur: (BA7) nasun-u⁹² ecus-un sudur: (BA8) qutuy-tu
 nidüber [11] üjegci erketü-yin⁹³ üjegsen-ü⁹⁴ doloyan nom-tu neretü⁹⁵ sudur:
 [12] (BA9) qutuy-tu bayasqulang-tu sudur: (BA10) qutuy-tu tabun baramid-i [13]
 uqaṭulqui yeke kölgen sudur: (BA11) üile-yi teyin büged {ial} ilyaqui: [14]
 yeke⁹⁶ sudur (BA12) bimbasari-yin⁹⁷ ündüsün-ü⁹⁸ neretü⁹⁹ sudur: (BA13) öglige-
 yin [15] yeke¹⁰⁰ sang: (BA14) tngri-yin köbegün erdini-yin¹⁰¹ ṭar-tu-yin
 asayuyṭsan (BA15) ilaju [16] tegüs̄ nögcigsen burqaṅ mayṭaju¹⁰² sayisiyaqui¹⁰³
 yosutu-aca¹⁰⁴ ilaju tegüs̄ [17] nögcigsen burqaṅ-i sayisiyaṭsan:

⁷⁸ NG(PK): degedü.

⁷⁹ NG(PK): kücü-dü.

⁸⁰ NG(PK): neretü.

⁸¹ In Tibetan. NG(PK): *add.* Mong. ba.

⁸² NG(PK): sagar-a-yin.

⁸³ NG(PK): neretü.

⁸⁴ NG(PK): erdeni-yin.

⁸⁵ NG(PK): neretü.

⁸⁶ Sic. NG(PK): qutay-tu.

⁸⁷ NG(PK): neretü.

⁸⁸ NG(PK): manjusiri-yin.

⁸⁹ NG(PK): neretü.

⁹⁰ NG(PK): noṭoyan.

⁹¹ NG(PK): neretü.

⁹² NG(PK): nasun-u.

⁹³ NG(PK): erketü-yin.

⁹⁴ Sic. = öcigsen-ü. NG(PK): öcigsen.

⁹⁵ NG(PK): neretü.

⁹⁶ NG(PK): *add.* kölgen.

⁹⁷ NG(PK): bimbasari-yin.

⁹⁸ NG(PK): ündüsün.

⁹⁹ NG(PK): neretü.

¹⁰⁰ Sic. NG(PK) gives the same reading. PK gives the correct reading: *küü* < Ch. *kou*.
 Z.K. Kas'ianenko transcribes it as *gü* KAS'IANENKO 1993, No. 713.

¹⁰¹ NG(PK): erdeni.

¹⁰² NG(PK): mayṭaqui.

¹⁰³ NG(PK): sayisiyaqui.

¹⁰⁴ NG(PK): yosu-tu-aca.

(BA16) tangyariy-dai¹⁰⁵ dar-a¹⁰⁶ / ökin tngri-[18]yin¹⁰⁷ maytayal: (BA17) / ary-a
 avalokita isvari-yin¹⁰⁸ maytayal: (BA18) *****-tu¹⁰⁹ [19] *****ng-tü¹¹⁰
 manjusiri-yin maytayal: (BA19) qutuy-tur maytaysan: (BA20) qutuy-tu [20]
 tangsuy boluysan neretü¹¹¹ nom-un jüil (BA21) nom-un mön cinar-aca ködelkü
 [21] ügegüy-e {****} öber-e öber-e bügüde-tür {**} üjegdeküi neretü¹¹²
 [22] sudur ede bui: : : arban jiryuduyar ma¹¹³ [23] gelmeli-tür (MA1) qutuy-tu
 langka avatar-a neretü¹¹⁴ yeke kölgen sudur: [24] (MA2) qutuy-tu asaraqui-yin
 öcigsen neretü¹¹⁵ yeke kölgen sudur: (MA3) qutuy-tu [25] qotala bitügci urtu
 kimusu-tu-yin¹¹⁶ öcigsen neretü¹¹⁷ sudur: (MA4) qutuy-tu [26] mayidari-yin
 yivanggirid üjügülügen: (MA5) qutuy-tu burqan-u uqayan-i [27] üjügülküi
 tegüs medeküi-tü sudur: (MA6) üneger tegüsügen sayşabad sudur: [28]
 (MA7) tabun ayımay aldal-un buyan kiged: buyan busu-yin aci ür-e-yi¹¹⁸
 onoqu-yin [29] sudur: (MA8) qutuy-tu nigen¹¹⁹ sedkiküi nomlaysan sudur:
 (MA9) qutuy-tu

It is clear from the text critical collation that, aside from minor variant readings, the two texts are almost identical. In NG(PK) the PA9 text is missing, but this seems to be rather the copyist's mistake than a structural difference between the two catalogues. Considering orthography, in both texts the final "s" is persistently written with the Uygur sign for "z" (a short horizontal "tail"; e.g. luus-un); the initial "t/d" in the case suffixes is regularly written with the use of the Uygur *taw* sign after the stems ending with vowels, diphthongs and, in certain consonants (e.g. gelmeli-tür; qatuytai-tur), "c" and "j" are regularly denoted with the same sign. Both texts give archaic spelling of such words as *bodi*, *bodisung*, *linqu-a* etc. With

¹⁰⁵ NG(PK): tangyariy-tai.

¹⁰⁶ NG(PK): d"ar-a.

¹⁰⁷ NG(PK): /eke-yin/. PK: ökin tngri-yin.

¹⁰⁸ NG(PK): /a-a ry-a avalokite' isvari-yin/.

¹⁰⁹ NG(PK): qutuy-tu.

¹¹⁰ NG(PK): kiling-tü.

¹¹¹ NG(PK): neretü.

¹¹² NG(PK): neretü.

¹¹³ In Tibetan. NG(PK): *add.* Mong. *ma*.

¹¹⁴ NG(PK): neretü.

¹¹⁵ NG(PK): neretü.

¹¹⁶ NG(PK): kimusutu-yin.

¹¹⁷ NG(PK): neretü.

¹¹⁸ NG(PK): ür-e-yin.

¹¹⁹ Sic. Should be *arban nigen*, cf Tib. 'du shes bcu gcig SUZUKI 1962, No. 977. Both PK and NG(HH) give *arban nigen*. ERDENİÇİLAŶU, ŞONGQOR 2013, 199 No. 74–09; KAS'IANENKO 1993, No. 732

this the frequent use of the Uygur *dāleth* for “t” in NG(JBF1) is changed in NG(PK) for “t” proper: *tangyariy-dai* > PK: *tangyariy-tai*. In NG(JBF1) the words *neretü*, *cinatu* and *erketü* (only one case in the text for the latter) are written with the use of the combination of the “loop” and the “tooth” to denote the medial “t/d” in front of the vowels. In the NG(PK) fragment such cases were not detected. The combination of the velar “q” and “i” is used only once in the correction in NG(JBF1): *qijayara* (in NG(PK) is given as *kijayar-a*).

In general the repertoire and arrangement of works in NG(JBF1) is similar to the corresponding PK volumes. However, there are some distinctions that are to be mentioned below. The correlation between NG(JBF1) and PK is demonstrated in *Table 1*.¹²⁰

Table 1

NG(JBF1)	Corresponds with the PK Nos.	Commentaries
<i>Eldeb, na</i>		
– ?	663	The beginning of Vol. <i>na</i> of the <i>Eldeb</i> section is absent in the extant NG(JBF1) fragment. Considering the fact that the initial text of the PK volume (No. 663) is also not mentioned in both NG(PK) and NG(HH), as well as the textual proximity of three catalogues, it is possible to suggest that it is also absent in NG(JBF1).
1–5	664–668	
<i>Eldeb, pa</i>		
1–6	669–674	
7	> 122, 126	The seventh text in the fragment of the catalogue, NG(JBF1) PA 7, does not have a counterpart in Vol. <i>pa, Eldeb</i> of PK — two duplicates of this text are contained in the Vols. <i>ja</i> and <i>nya</i> of the <i>Dandir-a</i> section (Nos. 122 and 126 correspondingly). Interestingly, in Tibetan Kanjur this text can be located in the <i>rGyud</i> section as part of the <i>Prajñā tantras</i> or in the <i>Shes rab sna tshogs</i> section as part of the minor <i>Prajñāpāramitā</i> texts. Some Tibetan Kanjurs have duplicates of the text in both sections. ¹²¹ Apart from

¹²⁰ The numbers of texts in PK are given according to KAS’IANENKO 1993. On the correspondence between the PK and Peking edition of the Tibetan Kanjur (Q) texts see USPENSKY 1997.

¹²¹ See HACKETT 2012, Nos. 37, 516.

		Vol. <i>pa</i> , <i>Eldeb</i> NG(PK) also marks the duplicate of the text in Vol. <i>ja</i> , of the <i>Dandir-a</i> section. ¹²² It also notes that during the translation from Tibetan into Mongolian small <i>Prajñāpāramitā</i> texts from the <i>Shes rab sna tshogs</i> section were mixed with other <i>sūtras</i> and placed in the <i>Eldeb</i> section of the Mongolian Kanjur. ¹²³ It is possible that the <i>Naran-u gerel</i> catalogue reflects both the dichotomy of the text under consideration and the relocation of one of its duplicates to the <i>Eldeb</i> section.
8–18	675–685	Of them NG(JBF1) PA 17 (= PK No. 684) does not have a counterpart in the Tibetan Kanjurs of the <i>Tshal pa</i> group. ¹²⁴
<i>Eldeb, pha</i>		
1–7	686–692	Of them NG(JBF1) PHA 6 (= PK No. 691) is the translation of the <i>Ratnakūṭa</i> text different from the one included in the <i>Ratnakūṭa</i> section (= PK No. 583). The duplicates of this text are included in several Kanjurs of the <i>Them spangs ma</i> group. For example, the Ulaanbaatar Kanjur also has its duplicate in Vol. <i>pha</i> of the <i>mDo sde</i> section. ¹²⁵
–	693	The eighth text in the PK volume is absent in both NG(JBF1) and NG(PK), but indicated in NG(HH). ¹²⁶
8–15	694–701	Of them NG(JBF1) PHA 13 (= PK No. 699), unidentified by V.L. Uspenskii, ¹²⁷ is the counterpart of Q No. 850. Its substantially edited version is included in MK. ¹²⁸ NG(JBF1) PHA 14 (= PK No. 700) is similarly placed in the <i>mDo sde</i> section in the Kanjurs of the <i>Them spangs ma</i> group; in Q it has two duplicates, Nos. 718 and 1040 placed in the <i>rGyud</i> and <i>'Dul ba</i> sections correspondingly. ¹²⁹
<i>Eldeb, ba</i>		
1–2	702–703	

¹²² KAS'IANENKO 1987, 173, 181.

¹²³ KAS'IANENKO 1987, 178. The list of the texts and their location see in ALEKSEEV 2015, 220.

¹²⁴ For its counterparts in the *Them spangs ma* Kanjurs see RKTS <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/verif/verif2.php?id=851> <last visited 02.08.2018>.

¹²⁵ See RKTS <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/verif/verif2.php?id=78>.

¹²⁶ See ERDENICILAYU, ŠONGQOR 2013, 198 No. 72–08.

¹²⁷ USPENSKY 1997, 143 No. 699.

¹²⁸ LIGETI 1942–1944, No. 938.

¹²⁹ RKTS <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/verif/verif2.php?id=1097>.

3	> 792	NG(JBF1) BA3 does not have a counterpart in PK, <i>Eldeb</i> , Vol. <i>ba</i> . It is located in Vol. <i>ya</i> of the <i>Eldeb</i> section (No. 792). NG(PK) places the text both into <i>Eldeb, ba</i> and <i>ya</i> . ¹³⁰ NG(HH) mentions this text only in the <i>ya</i> volume. ¹³¹
4–16	704–717	Of them PK Nos. 713 and 714 do not have identifiable counterparts in Q. NG(JBF1) BA 15 corresponds with PK Nos. 715 and 716. ¹³² In the “standard” Tibetan editions of the Kanjur these texts, as well as PK No. 717, are included in the Danjur. ¹³³
17	–	NG(JBF1) BA 17 does not have an identifiable counterpart in PK. It is presented in both manuscript catalogues with some minor variant readings as the <i>Ary-a avalokita isvari-yin maytayal</i> , but absent in NG(HH). The text, possibly, can be a translation of one of the prayers to Avalokiteśvara (Skr. <i>stotra</i> , Tib. <i>bstod pa</i>) located in the Danjur (considering the use of the genitive in the Mongolian translation of the title, most probably, Q 3554 or 3561). ¹³⁴
–	718–719	PK No. 718 is a <i>stotra</i> from the Danjur (Q 3533). ¹³⁵ Both texts are included in NG(HH). ¹³⁶
18–19	possibly, 720–721	Have no identifiable counterparts in Q. ¹³⁷
–	722	The text is also absent in NG(HH). Has no identifiable counterparts in Q. ¹³⁸
20	–	NG(JBF1) No. 20 does not have a counterpart in PK and is included only in the block-printed edition of the Mongolian Kanjur. ¹³⁹ Absent in NG(HH).

¹³⁰ For the classification and location of this text in the Tibetan Kanjurs see HACKETT 2012, No. 294.

¹³¹ ERDENIČILAŪU, ŠONGQOR 2013, 201 No. 83–03.

¹³² In NG(JBF1) these texts are also presented separately ERDENIČILAŪU, ŠONGQOR 2013, 198 Nos. 73–14, 73–15.

¹³³ See USPENSKY 1997, 143.

¹³⁴ See SUZUKI 1962, 381–382. Interestingly a short prayer to Avalokiteśvara was discovered among the tantric manuscripts from Dunhuang. As noted by T. Dalton and S. van Schaik: “This prayer is not similar to any of the Avalokiteśvara *stotra* texts in the *Bstan 'gyur*” DALTON, VAN SCHAİK 2006, 41.

¹³⁵ The text is missing in the main part of the V. L. Uspenskii’s *Concordance* but mentioned in the *Index*. USPENSKY 1997, 159.

¹³⁶ ERDENIČILAŪU, ŠONGQOR 2013, 198 Nos. 73–17, 73–18.

¹³⁷ USPENSKY 1997, 144.

¹³⁸ USPENSKY 1997, 144.

¹³⁹ LIGETI 1942–1944, No. 1079. See the classification and position of the text in the Tibetan Kanjurs in HACKETT 2012, No. 337.

21	723	
<i>Eldeb, ma</i>		
1–3	724–726	
–	727	Present in NG(HH). ¹⁴⁰
4–8	728–732	
9	733?	Only one word is left on the folio from the next title, NG(JBF1) No. 9. Judging by NG(PK) and NG(HH) the text possibly correlates with PK No. 733.

The discovery of the *Naran-u Gerel* fragment among the folios of the Dzungar Kanjurs in the library of IOM, RAS and its textual proximity to the manuscript preserved in the St. Petersburg State University Library prove that NG(PK) was not a single copy of the catalogue representing some preliminary draft of the Ligdan's recension of the Mongolian Kanjur, as it was previously believed. In general both NG(JBF1) and NG(PK) duplicate the structure of the volumes *na*, *pa*, *pha*, *ba* and *ma* of the *Eldeb* section in PK and other manuscript copies of the Mongolian Kanjur. This observation possibly indicates that the structure of Ligdan's recension, which still remains a conundrum for the scholars,¹⁴¹ was not that random. Some differences between the catalogues and the complete manuscript Kanjur sets probably reflect different stages of Kanjur formation in both the Tibetan and Mongolian cultural worlds. Some of these structural peculiarities that also occur in the Tibetan Kanjurs of the *Them spangs ma* group possibly point at an archaic Tibetan source or sources that were used when the Mongolian Kanjur was created in the 17th c.

References

- ALEKSEEV Kirill 2015: "Mongol'skii Gandzhur: genezis i struktura" [The Mongolian Kanjur: Genesis and Structure]. *Strany i narody Vostoka* [Countries and peoples of the East], XXXVI, 190–228.
- ALEKSEEV Kirill and TURANSKAYA Anna 2013: "An overview of the Altan Kanjur Kept at the Library of the Academy of Social Sciences of Inner Mongolia". *Asiatische Studien*, LXVII (3), 755–782.
- DALTON, Jacob and VAN SCHAİK, Sam 2006: *Tibetan Tantric Manuscripts from Dunhuang: a descriptive catalogue of the Stein Collection at the British Library*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- ERDENIČILAYU, Š. and ŠONGQOR, A. (Hrsg.) (2013): *Ganĵur. Orosil-un boti* [The Kanjur: Introductory Volume]. Kōkeqota: Ōbör mongyol-un suryan kümüjil-ün keblel-ün qoriy-a.

¹⁴⁰ ERDENIČILAYU, ŠONGQOR 2013, 198 No. 74–04.

¹⁴¹ On the structure of the Mongolian manuscript Kanjur see ALEKSEEV 2015, 213–222.

- HACKETT, Paul G. 2012: *A Catalogue of the Comparative Kangyur (Bka'-gyur dpe bsdur ma)*. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies.
- IAMPOL'SKAIA Natalia (2015): "Svodnyi perechen' fragmentov rukopisei 'chërnykh' mongol'skikh Gandzhurov v kolleksii IVR RAN" [A Consolidated List of Fragments of "Black" Mongolian Manuscript Kanjurs in the Collection of IOM, RAS]. *Mongolica*, XV, 48–58.
- KAS'IANENKO Zoia K. 1987: "Oglavlenie mongol'skogo 'Gandzhura' pod nazvaniem 'Solnechnyi svet'" [Catalogue of the Mongolian Kanjur Entitled *The Sunlight*]. *Pismennye pamiatniki Vostoka: Istoriko-filologicheskie issledovaniia. Ezhegodnik 1978–1979* [Written Monuments of the Orient. Annual essays on history and philology 1978–1979]. Moscow: Nauka, 158–175.
- KAS'IANENKO Zoia K. 1993: *Katalog peterburgskogo rukopisnogo "Gandzhura". Sostavleniie, vvedeniie, transliteratsiia i ukazateli Z.K. Kas'ianenko* [Catalogue of the St. Petersburg Manuscript Kanjur. Introduction, transliteration and indices compiled by Z.K. Kas'ianenko]. Moscow: Nauka (Pamiatniki pis'mennosti Vostoka [Written Monuments of the Orient] CII; Bibliotheca Buddhica XXXIX).
- KOLLMAR-PAULENZ, Karénina 2002: "The Transmission of the Mongolian Kanjur: A Preliminary Report". In: Helmut Eimer, David Germano (eds.): *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism. PIATS 2000: Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for the Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000*. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 151–176.
- LIGETI, Louis 1942–1944: *Catalogue du Kanjur Mongol imprimé: Vol. I Catalogue*. Budapest: Societé Kőrösi Csoma.
- RKTS: *Resources for Kanjur & Tanjur Studies*. URL: <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/sub/index.php> < last visited 12.04.2018 >.
- SCHERRER-SCHAUB, Cristina A. and BONANI, George 2002: "Establishing a Typology of the Old Tibetan Manuscripts: a Multidisciplinary Approach". In: *Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries*. London: The British Library, 184–215.
- STEINKELLNER, Ernst 1994: "A Report on the 'Kanjur' of Ta pho". *East and West*, 44(1), 115–136.
- SUZUKI, Daisetz T. 1962: *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking edition, Kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto: catalogue and index*. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation.
- TAUSCHER, Helmut 2008: *Catalogue of the Gondhla proto-Kanjur*. Universität Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien.
- USPENSKY Vladimir 1997: "The Tibetan Equivalents to the Titles of the Texts in the St. Petersburg Manuscript of Mongolian Kanjur: A Reconstructed Catalogue". In: Helmut EIMER (ed.): *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon. Papers Presented at a Panel of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 113–176.
- YG: *Dumdadu ulus-un erten-ü mongyol nom bičig-ün yerüingkei yarčay* [Catalogue of Ancient Mongolian Books and Documents of China], 3 vols. Begejing: Begejing nom-un sang jöblel-ün joriy-a, 1999.