

KIRILL ALEKSEEV

(St. Petersburg State University, Russia)

On the Identification of the Mongolian “Golden” Fragments from Dzungaria*

Abstract

The article presents the results of the discovery and text-critical analysis of the Mongolian-language “golden” manuscript fragments brought to Russia and Europe from Dzungaria in the 18th century. At present 34 fragments have been detected in various depositories. The fragments belong to one set of the Mongolian Kanjur most likely dated from the first half of the 17th century. The list of the texts, to which the fragments belong, is given at the end of the article. The text-critical analysis of the fragments reveals that they contain a plethora of preclassic orthography and spelling of loanwords. Three fragments contain the text of the hitherto unknown Mongolian version of the *Bhadrakalpika-sūtra*, which differs from Dayičing Tayiji’s translation included in the bulk of the Mongolian Kanjur copies.

Keywords: Dzungar fragments, Mongolian Kanjur, “golden” manuscripts, manuscriptology, text-critical analysis

Recent years have witnessed an increased academic interest in the so called Dzungar fragments – separate folios of the Buddhist canonical text in the Tibetan and Mongolian languages brought to various Russian and European depositories from one of the abandoned Dzungar monasteries in the 18th century.¹ Of these, the fragments of the Mongolian-

* 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.*

¹ On the Dzungar fragments see Alekseev 2015, p. 203, 2017, pp. 40–41, 2019; Alekseev and Turanskaya 2015; Alekseev, Turanskaya, and Yampol’skaya 2014; Alekseev, Turanskaya, and Yampolskaya 2015, 2016; Heissig 1979,

language Kanjur written in gold on a black and blue background (abbreviated as JGF) are of special interest due to their outlook and a certain proximity to the Golden Kanjur kept at the Academy of Social Sciences of Inner Mongolia.

The article represents the final stage of detection, identification and text-critical analysis of JGF preceding the publication of the complete JGF texts. By now 34 folios have been discovered in the following depositories:

- Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences (IOM): 20 fragments, pressmark K 37;
- British Library (BL): four fragments, pressmarks Sloane 2838 (a), 2838 (b), Stowe 32 F. 13 and F. 14;
- Library of the University of Glasgow (LUG): three fragments, pressmark PL 61;
- National Library of France (BNF): two fragments, pressmark Tibétain 464;
- Berlin State Library (SB): one fragment, pressmark Ms. or. Fol. 477;
- Francke Foundations, Halle (FF): one fragment, pressmark R.-Nr. 48;
- Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel (HAB): one fragment, pressmark Cod. Guelf. 9 Extrav.;
- Kassel University Library (KUL): one fragment, pressmark Ms. orient. Anhang 3;
- Linköping City Library (LCL): one fragment, pressmark OL 3.

The bulk of JGF do not have any markers (like a work or chapter title) that would allow them to be associated with specific canonical texts. Moreover, some of the folios have lost their segments with the markers of the Kanjur sections and volume signatures. Therefore, the identification of JGF was first carried out with the use of the searchable e-texts of the Tibetan Kanjurs accessible at *The Buddhist Canons Research Database*² and the *Resources for Kanjur & Tanjur Studies*.³ Then the corresponding fragments were located within the manuscript Kanjur preserved in the St. Petersburg State University Library (PK), the only complete Mongolian manuscript Kanjur known so far. Finally a thorough text-critical collation of JGF and PK was implemented. The research performed allows certain assumptions to be made about the repertoire and structure of the Kanjur, to which JGF belonged, and for it to be correlated with other Mongolian manuscript Kanjurs.

Interestingly, all the JGF folios belong solely to the initial, i.e. *ka* volumes, of the Kanjur sections, which leaves open the possibility that only these volumes were produced or brought to the Dzungar monasteries. The identification of JGF demonstrated that seven of the 34 folios belong to the five texts of the *Dandir-a*, thirteen – to the *Yum*, two – to the *Olangki*, three – to the one text of the *Erdeni dabqurlii*, and four – to the one text of the *Vinay-a* sections of the Mongolian Kanjur. The list of the canonical texts to which JGF belong is provided in the *Appendix* to the article. It includes the titles of texts in Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Mongolian; the references to the two existing catalogues of the

1998, pp. 158–159; Helman-Ważny, Kriakina, and Zorin 2015; Yampol'skaya 2015; Knüppel 2014; Kollmar-Paulenz 2017; Yampolskaya 2015, 2017; Zorin 2015.

² BCRD.

³ RKTS.

Mongolian Kanjurs by Z.K. Kas’yanenko⁴ and L. Ligeti⁵ as well as to *A Catalogue of the Comparative Kangyur* compiled by P. Hackett.⁶ For the JGF fragments the folio number, the depository, the section/chapter of a text, and the folio(s) numbers of the corresponding fragment in PK that was used for the text-critical collation are given.

Apart from three fragments all JGF represent the same Mongolian translations of the Kanjur texts as those included in PK. Evaluating the results of the text-critical collation of JGF and PK as a whole would be problematic, because the Mongolian Kanjurs amalgamate texts that were translated asynchronously and may preserve peculiarities of the former versions and copies. The results of the analysis may even vary for the textual fragments written down by different scribes. Nevertheless, as at present only 34 JGF folios are available for the study, conclusions can be reached about a certain “concentration” of orthographic and linguistic characteristics in both manuscripts.

Both JGF and PK contain a plethora of preclassic orthography and it is difficult to find specifics that exist in one manuscript and not in the other. Nevertheless, in the cases of variant readings between two manuscripts JGF would reveal a higher concentration of certain orthographic characteristics even within the framework of rather restricted textual materials.

First of all, in JGF the Uyghur *dāleth* is repeatedly used to denote “t” in the possessive suffixes and clitic *-tan*, a combination of the possessive and plural suffixes: *čarai-dai*, *düri-den*, *erke-den-nuyud-i*, *gergei-den*, *ijaγur-dani*, *ijaγur-danu*, *öngge-den*, *sedkil-dei*, *tangyariγ-dan* (cf. PK: *čirai-tai*, *düriten*, *erketen-nügüd-i*, *gergei-ten*, *ijaγur-tan-i*, *ijaγur-tanu*, *önggeten*, *sedkil-tei*, *tangyariγ-tan*). In contrast, only three such cases can be found in PK: *ijaγur-dan-u*, *kürdü-den*, *üjesküleng-dei* (cf. JGF: *ijaγur-tan-u*, *kürdüten*, *üjesküleng-tei*).

Secondly, JGF reveal multiple cases where the letters “q” and “γ” are found with front vowels and “k/g” – with the back vowels: *bayalig-ud-un*, *bilig-luy-a*, *buγaküli*, *čidabagü-üü*, *dulduyidugsan*, *erke-den-nuyud-i*, *örösiyenggü-luy-a*, *ridi köl-nuyud-i*, *sakyalig-ud*, *sonosbagü* (cf. PK: *bayaliγ-ud-un*, *bilig-lüge*, *bükül-i*, *čidabayu-uu*, *dulduyidugsan*, *erketen-nügüd-i*, *örösiyenggü-lüge*, *ridi köl-nügüd-i*, *sakyaliγ-ud*, *sonosbayu*) in comparison with only two such cases in PK: *dengseliγsan-i*, *mergen-luy-a* (cf. JGF: *dengselügsen-i*, *merged-lüge*).

Similarly, JGF exceed PK with regard to cases where words can be written separately: *ali-ba*, *amur-a*,⁷ *čoy-tu*, *dayin-i daruγsan*, *es-e*, *γirγayulqu-i*, *ner-e-idümü*, *nis-vanis*, *qarangyu-i*, *tamay-a-laydaqui*, *tus-a* with some of these cases repeated several times (cf. PK: *aliba*, *amura*, *čoytu*, *dayini daruγsan*, *ese*, *γirγayulqui*, *nereyidümü*, *nisvanis*, *qarangyui*, *tamayalaydaqui*, *tusa*). Lesser such cases are found in PK: *dayin-i daruγsan*, *keγiye-de*, *mingγ-a-tu* (cf. JGF: *dayini daruγsan*, *keγiyede*, *mingγatu*).

Also, relative to PK, JGF offer the archaic spelling of some loanwords, e.g. *lam-a*, *indira*, *mudur-a*, *qi včir-a*, *hung/huang*, *ubadiγ-a* etc. (cf. PK: *blam-a*, *indra*, *mudr-a*, *hi*

⁴ Kas’yanenko 1993.

⁵ Ligeti 1942–1944.

⁶ Hackett 2012.










⁷ = Tib. *bya skyibs* – ‘a shelter’, in particular, ‘an overhanging rock shelter’, ‘clefts in rocks’.

he' včir, huum', ubadini).⁸ In the two cases where India is mentioned, JGF give *endkeg* (sic) while PK – *enedkeg* and *hindkeg*.⁹ To this JGF add a much more restricted use of the *Galik* alphabet, e.g. *oom, kečari, tatagata, qang* etc. (cf. PK: *o'm', k'e'j'arii, d''a ta-a g'ata, ham'*) and the characteristic use of “i” at the beginning of the transcribed Tibetan and Sanskrit words, e.g. *irjudči* < Tib. *rgyud kyi, irgalbo* < Tib. *rgyal po, injan-a* < Skr. *jñāna* (cf. PK: *rgyud' kyi, rgyalpo'-i, inyan-a*).¹⁰

Notably, PK has a number of scribal mistakes indicating that the scribes did not have a complete understanding of the text. Thus, for example, *qamuy onol-un qayan* < Tib. *rtog pa thams cad kyi rgyal po* ‘king of all comprehensions’ is mistakenly changed in PK to *qamuy nom-un qayan* ‘king of all Dharmas’; *ariluyšan* < Tib. *rnam dag pa* ‘utterly pure’ – to *ügüleksen* ‘the one, who said’; *beke* < Tib. *snag tsha* ‘ink’ – to *bey-e* ‘body’; *itegel* < Tib. *mgon po* ‘protector’ – to *sedkil* ‘thought’; *ölge* < Tib. *spo* ‘summit of a mountain’ – to *öglige* ‘alms’; *qangyan* < Tib. *tshim* ‘to satisfy’ – to *qayan* ‘king, khan’; *tari* < Tib. *sgrol ma*, (Skr. *tāra*) ‘the saviouress’ – to *tarni* ‘mantra’; *öber-ün öber-ün düi-ner-i* < Tib. *rang rang gi sring mo* ‘each own sister’ is rendered in PK as *öber öber-ün-tür-ner-i*, where the word *düi* was turned into the dative-locative suffix *-tür* and so on.

Three JGF fragments represent the hitherto unknown Mongolian version of the *Bhadrakalpika-sūtra* that differs from the Dayičing Tayiji’s (late 16th–early 17th centuries)¹¹ translation included in the bulk of the Mongolian Kanjur copies (see the *Appendix* Nos. 9.1–9.3). Two of them, preserved in the Berlin State Library and Linköping City Library, have already been examined and published.¹² Recently, a fragment kept in the British Library was added to the list (JGF-BL). The folio was purchased among other Mongolian fragments by the Scottish traveler John Bell (1691–1780) in the city of Tobolsk during his journey through Siberia. A note of this event is marked in his travel essays

⁸ In transcription of Mongolian text the following symbols are used for the *Galik* letters and editorial marks:

<...> – glosses and interpolations, d’ – , d” – , d* – , e’ – , g’ – , j’ – , k’ – , m’ – , o’ – .

⁹ The use of two forms *hindkeg* and *enedkeg* denoting “India” or “Indian” for dating Mongolian texts of the 17th century is confusing. On the basis of the fact that the form *hindustānu* is found in the *Mukaddimat al-Adab* dating to the 14th–15th centuries (Pope 1938, p. 185) and an analysis of the different versions of Mongolian texts, some scholars see the form *hindkeg* representing the older reading. (Heissig 1957, pp. 77–78; Kollmar-Paulenz 2002, p. 164) Nevertheless, the form *änäkäk* was used in the Uyghur literary monuments even before the 13th century (see Nadeliaev et al. 1969, p. 173; Weiers 1969, p. 56 n. 1). Besides, other scholars adhere to the opposing position. Thus, for example, according to A. Sárközi 1982, p. 467, “in later texts the form *Hindkeg* is more frequent” than *enedkeg*. In our opinion, both forms were equally in use in Mongolian texts at the turn of the 16th–17th centuries. The most eloquent evidence of this is the use of both forms almost on the same page of the *Erdeni Tunumal*, see Elverskog 2003, p. 254 line 598, p. 255 line 613; Kollmar-Paulenz 2001, p. 174 stanza 147, p. 175 stanza 150).

¹⁰ According to W. Heissig 1966, pp. 43–47, the use of prosthetic vowels in the transcription of words in other languages aids dating such Mongolian texts to a time no later than the 16th–first half of the 17th centuries. It was especially characteristic of the texts produced in Ordos and Tümed at the turn of the 16th–17th centuries (Heissig 1961, p. 575).

¹¹ W. Heissig identifies him with the well-known Sečen dayičing kiya bayši. On him and his translations see Heissig 1954a, Nos. 5, 16, 1954b, pp. 107–108, 1959, p. 45 n. 5, 1962, pp. 19–20.

¹² For details see Alekseev and Turanskaya 2015; Alekseev 2020.

for the year 1719.¹³ Having returned home, he presented it to the learned antiquarian Sir Hans Sloane whose collection became the foundation for the British Museum.¹⁴

This is the 24th folio, belonging to the second chapter (Mong. *bölög*) of the *Bhadralpika*. Its text-critical collation with the corresponding PK fragment located on the folio 5v (*Eldeb* section, volume *ka*) adds some interesting new details of the differences between the two Mongolian versions of the *sūtra*, several of which are given below.

Thus, for example, Tib. *rgyal chen bzhi'i ris kyi lha* ‘the gods in the abode of the Four Great Kings’ is rendered in JGF-BL as almost the reverse translation into Sanskrit *çatur maqaraḥa kayika-taki tngri*, where Skr. *kāyika* ‘belonging to an assemblage or multitude’¹⁵ is the equivalent of Tib. *ris* ‘group, section, type, class’. PK gives a more conventional *dörben maqaraḥas-un ayimay-un tngri*. Tib. *gtams pa bye ba sum khri* denoting an extremely large number is translated as *γurban tümen költi kanikar-a toyatan*, where *kanikar-a* < Skr. *kaṅkara* means ‘a particular high number’.¹⁶ PK gives *mingyan nayud költi γurban tümen*. Similarly, Tib. *'khor los bsgyur ba'i rgyal po*, i.e. ‘*cakravartin*, universal monarch’ > JGF-BL: *çakirvad* vs PK: *kürdüni* (sic) *orçiyulayçi qaγan*; Tib. *mi 'khrugs pa* [Buddha] Akṣobhya’ > JGF-BL: *aksobi* vs PK: *ülü qudqulayçi*. An analogous adherence to the preservation of Sanskrit words is encountered in the 14th century Mongolian translation of the *Pañcarakṣā*. Here, Akṣobhya is also rendered as *aksobi*, *cakravartin* – as *çakiravadi* and Tib. *tshangs rigs kyi lha* ‘the gods in the Abode of Brahmā’ – as *braqmakayig dakis tngri*.¹⁷ In the late 16th century translation by Ayusi Güsi the majority of these terms were translated from Tibetan word by word.¹⁸

Judging by the identification of JGF and the results of their text-critical collation with PK the Kanjur that they are a part of, belongs to the 1628–1629 Ligdan Khan’s manuscript recension and most likely dates from the first half of the 17th century. In common with the Hohhot Golden Kanjur, in some aspects of their orthographic and linguistic characteristics, JGF reveal a higher density of preclassic elements.

The presence amongst JGF of the fragments of a hitherto unknown and possibly more archaic version of the *Bhadralpika-sūtra* correlates well with the inclusion of the 14th century Mongolian translation of the *Pañcarakṣā* into the Hohhot Golden Kanjur. Both texts are different from the later translations by Dayičing Tayiji and Ayusi Güsi included into the rest of the Mongolian Kanjur copies. This fact allows it to be suggested that within the Ligdan Khan’s recension there were at least two groups of Kanjurs – one with the more archaic translations of the abovementioned texts and another, where they were substituted for the later ones.

¹³ Bell 1763, p. 193.

¹⁴ See Scott 1904, p. iii; Ayscough 1782, pp. 903–904.

¹⁵ Monier-Williams 1899, p. 274.

¹⁶ Monier-Williams 1899, p. 242. See also Rintchen 1959, I, p. 823: *gtams – kaM ka ra* = Mong. *kam'kar-a*.

¹⁷ See, for example, Aalto 1961, pp. 31, 59, 77.

¹⁸ For a description of the Buddhist terminology in the two translations of the *Pañcarakṣā* see Sárközi 2010.

Appendix

I *Dandir-a* Section, Volume *ka*

1

Skr. *Paramādibuddhoddhrita-śrī-kālacakra-nāma-tantrarājā*, Tib. *mChog gi dang po'i sangs rgyas las phyung ba rgyud kyi rgyal po dpal dus kyi 'khor lo zhes bya ba*, Mong. *Angqan-u degedü burqan-ača yarγaysan čoy-tu čay-un kürdün neretü d''and'iris-<un> qayan*.¹⁹

Ref.: Kas'yanenko 1993: No. 3; Ligeti 1942–1944: No. 3; Hackett 2012: No. 387.

1.1 F. 140 (BL, Stowe 32 F. 13). 5th *bölög*. PK: 36r.

1.2 F. 164 (IOM-1).²⁰ 5th *bölög*. PK: 42r–42v.

2

Skr. *Śrī-sarvabuddha-sama-yoga-dākinijāla-saṃbara-nāma-uttaratantra*, Tib. *dPal sangs rgyas thams cad dang mnyam par sbyor ba mkha' 'gro ma sgyu ma bde ba'i mchog ces bya ba'i rgyud bla ma*, Mong. *Čoy-tu qamuy burqad-luy-a tegsi barilduyči d*agini yelvi jiryalang-un manglai neretü degedü d''and'r-a*.

Ref.: Kas'yanenko 1993: No. 7; Ligeti 1942–1944: No. 7; Hackett 2012: No. 391.

F. ? (HAB).²¹ 9th *onol*. PK: 60v.

3–4

The end of the Skr. *Sarvakalpa-samuccaya-nāma-sarvabuddha-samayoga-dākinijāla-saṃbara-uttarottaratantra*, Tib. *rTog pa thams cad 'dus pa zhes bya ba sangs rgyas thams cad dang mnyam par sbyor ba mkha' 'gro sgyu ma bde ba'i mchog gi rgyud phyi ma'i phyi ma*, Mong. *Qamuy onol-<i>quriyaγsan ner-e-tü qamuy burqad-luy-a tegsi barilduyči d*agini yelvi jiryalang-un degedü-yin qoyitu d''and'r-a*.

Ref.: Kas'yanenko 1993: No. 8; Ligeti 1942–1944: No. 8; Hackett 2012: No. 392.

The beginning of the Skr. *Hevajra-tantra-rāja-nāma*, Tib. *Kye'i rdo rje zhes bya ba rgyud kyi rgyal po*, Mong. *Qi včir-a neretü dandaris-un qayan*.²²

Ref.: Kas'yanenko 1993: No. 9; Ligeti 1942–1944: No. 9; Hackett 2012: No. 440 (a).

F. 276 (IOM-2). PK: 73r.

4

Tib. *Ki'i (kye'i) rdo rje mkha' 'gro ma dra ba'i sdom pa'i rgyud kyi rgyal po*. In PK this text is the part of the Mong. *Qi včir-a neretü dandaris-un qayan*.²³

Ref.: Kas'yanenko 1993: No. 9; Ligeti 1942–1944: No. 9; Hackett 2012: No. 440 (b).

F. 309 (LUG).²⁴ 6th – 7th *bölög*. PK: 81v–82r.

¹⁹ Except for No. 4 of the list the Mongolian titles of the texts are given according to PK.

²⁰ The numbers of the IOM fragments are given according to the list in Alekseev, Turanskaya, and Yampolskaya 2016: 95–101.

²¹ For the description and analysis of the fragment see Alekseev, Turanskaya, and Yampolskaya 2015; Heissig 1979; Wolf-Dieter 1986, Part 1: 10 No. V).

²² The only text title preserved in JGF.

²³ See above.

²⁴ For the description of the fragment see Weston 2018, p. 192.

5

Skr. *Ārya-dākinī-vajrapañjara-mahātantrarāja-kalpa-nāma*, Tib. *'Phags pa mkha' 'gro ma rdo rje gur zhes bya ba'i rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po'i brtag pa*, Mong. *Qutuy-tu d*agini včir darma-tu kemegdekü dand'aras-un qayan-u onol*.

Ref.: Kas'yanenko 1993: No. 10; Ligeti 1942–1944: No. 10; Hackett 2012: No. 441.

5.1 F. 335 (IOM-3). 7th – 8th *bölög*. PK: 88r.

5.2 F. ? (IOM-17).²⁵ 8th *bölög*. PK 88v–89r.

II *Yum* Section, Volume *ka*

6

Skr. *Śatasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*, Tib. *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag brgya pa*, Mong. *Bilig-ün činadu kürügsen jayun mingyan toy-a-tu*.

Ref.: Kas'ianenko 1993: No. 524; Ligeti 1942–1944: No. 746; Hackett 2012: 25.

6.1 F. ? (IOM-20).²⁶ 2nd – 3rd *bölög*. PK: 5v–6r.

6.2 F. 62 (IOM-5). 4th *bölög*. PK: 17v–18r.

6.3 F. ? (BL, Sloane 2838 (b)). 6th *bölög*. PK: 23v.

6.4 F. 153 (IOM-6). 10th *bölög*. PK: 41r.

6.5 F. 156 (IOM-4).²⁷ 10th *bölög*. PK: 41v–42r.

6.6 F. ? (IOM-18). 15th–16th *bölög*. PK: 62r–62v.

6.7 F. 240 (IOM-7). 16th *bölög*. PK: 65v.

6.8 F. 278 (IOM-8). 19th *bölög*. PK: 75r.

6.9 F. 316 (LUG).²⁸ 21st *bölög*. PK: 84v.

6.10 F. ? (FF). 21st – 22nd *bölög*. PK: 88r.

6.11 F. ? (IOM-19).²⁹ 22nd *bölög*. PK: 89r.

6.12 Two fragments of F. 348 (IOM-9, 21).³⁰ 22nd *bölög*. PK: 89v–90r.

6.13 F. 353 (IOM-10). 23rd *bölög*. PK: 93v–94r.

III *Olangki* Section, Volume *ka*

7

Skr. *Buddha-avatamsaka-nāma-mahāvaiṣṭya-sūtra*, Tib. *Sangs rgyas phal po che zhes bya ba shin tu rgyas pa chen po'i mdo*, Mong. *Olangki burqan neretü masida delgeregsen yeke sudur*.

Ref.: Kas'yanenko 1993: No. 546; Ligeti 1942–1944: No. 842; Hackett 2012: No. 61.

7.1 F. 47 (BNF). 4th *keseg*. PK: 10v.

²⁵ The *incip.* and *term.* in Alekseev, Turanskaya, and Yampolskaya 2016: No. 17 should be swapped.

²⁶ The *incip.* and *term.* in Alekseev, Turanskaya, and Yampolskaya 2016: No. 20 should be swapped.

²⁷ The number of the folio in Alekseev, Turanskaya, and Yampolskaya 2016, No. 4 should be changed from 56 to 156. The foliation contains a hardly visible cross denoting a hundred.

²⁸ The description of the folio see in Weston 2018, p. 192.

²⁹ The *incip.* and *term.* in Alekseev, Turanskaya, and Yampolskaya 2016, No. 19 should be swapped.

³⁰ For fragment No. 21 the *incip.* and *term.* in Alekseev, Turanskaya, and Yampolskaya 2016: No. 21 should be swapped.

7.2 F. 68 (IOM-11). 5th *keseg*. PK: 16v.

7.3 F. 153 (BNF). 10th–11th *keseg*. PK: 38v.

7.4 F. 211 (IOM-12). 16th *keseg*. PK: 55r.

IV *Erdeni Dabqurliy Section, Volume ka*

8

Skr. *Ārya-anantamukha-parisodhana-nirdeśa-parivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, Tib. *'Phags pa sgo mtha' yas pa rnam par sbyong ba bstan pa'i le'u zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*, Mong. *Qutuy-tu kijayalal ügei teyin ariluyᠰan qayaly-a-yi uqayuluyᠰan neretü yeke kölgen sudur*.

Ref.: Kas'yanenko 1993: No. 558; Ligeti 1942–1944: No 793; Hackett 2012: No. 63.

8.1 F. 59 (BL, Stowe 32 F. 14). 2nd *keseg*. PK: 13v.

8.2 F. 88 (KUL).³¹ 3rd *keseg*. PK: 20r–20v.

8.3 F. 89 (IOM-16). 3rd *keseg*. PK: 20v.

V *Eldeb Section, Volume ka*

9

Skr. *Ārya-bhadrakalpika-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, Tib. *'Phags pa bskal pa bzang po pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*, Mong. *Qutuy-tu sayin čay-un neretü yeke kölgen sudur*.

Ref.: Kas'yanenko 1993: No. 615; Ligeti 1942–1944: No. 849; Hackett 2012: No. 111.

9.1 F. 24 (BL, Sloane 2838 (a)). 2nd *bölög*. PK: 5v.

9.2 F. 81 (SB).³² 6th *bölög*. PK: 16v.

9.3 F. 109? (LCL).³³ 7th *bölög*. PK: 21v.

VI *Vinay-a Section, Volume ka*

10

Skr. *Vinaya-vastu*, Tib. *'Dul ba gzhi*, Mong. *Nomoyadqaqui sitügen*.

Ref.: Kas'yanenko 1993: No. 599; Ligeti 1942–1944: No. 1125; Hackett 2012: No. 1.

10.1 F. 53 (LUG).³⁴ 4th *keseg*. PK: 15v.

10.2 F. 216 (IOM-13). 15th *keseg*. PK: 59v–60r.

10.3 F. 284 (IOM-14). 19th *keseg*. PK: 78v.

10.4 F. 449 (IOM-15). 30th *keseg*. PK: 126r–126v.

³¹ The fragment is published in Knüppel 2014, pp. 11–14, pp. 95–98. In M. Knüppel's transcription the *recto* and *verso* sides of the folio are confused.

³² For the description and analysis of the fragment see Alekseev and Turanskaya 2015.

³³ For the description and analysis of the fragment see Heissig 1979, pp. 200–202; Alekseev 2019.

³⁴ See the description of the folio in Weston 2018, p. 192.

Abbreviations

BCRD	The Buddhist Canons Research Database
BL	British Library
BNF	National Library of France
FF	Francke Foundations
HAB	Herzog August Bibliothek
IOM	Institute of Oriental Manuscripts
JGF	Dzungar “golden” fragments
KUL	Kassel University Library
LCL	Linköping City Library
LUG	Library of the University of Glasgow
PK	St. Petersburg manuscript Kanjur
RKTS	Resources for Kanjur & Tanjur Studies
SB	Berlin State Library

Bibliography

- Aalto, Pentti (ed.), 1961, *Qutuγ-u pañcarakṣā kemekü tabun sakiyan neretü yeke kölgen sudur: nach dem stockholmer Xylograph 15.1.699*, Asiatische Forschungen 10, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Alekseev, Kirill, 2015, *Mongol'skiy Gandzhur: genezis i struktura*, “Strany i narody Vostoka” XXXVI, pp. 190–228.
- 2017, *On the Correlations between the Copies of the Mongolian Manuscript Kanjur*, in S. Chuluun (ed.) *Mongol Ganzhuur: olan ulsyn sudalgaa*, Shinzhlekh ukhaany akademi, Tüükh, arkheologiyn khüreelel, Ulaanbaatar, pp. 37–50.
- 2020, *A Note on the So-Called Codex Renatus Lincopensis* (in print).
- Alekseev, Kirill, Anna Turanskaya, and Natalia Yampol'skaya, 2014, *Fragmenty mongol'skogo rukopisnogo Gandzhura v sobranii IVR RAN*, “Pis'mennye pamyatniki Vostoka” 1 (20), pp. 206–224.
- Alekseev, Kirill, and Anna Turanskaya, 2015, *A Folio from the Berlin State Library – Additional Remarks on the History of the Mongolian Kanjur*, “Rocznik Orientalistyczny” LXVIII (2), pp. 9–23.
- Alekseev, Kirill, Anna Turanskaya, and Natalia Yampolskaya, 2015, *The First Mongolian Manuscript in Germany Reconsidered*, “Written Monuments of the Orient” 1, pp. 67–77.
- 2016, *Mongolian Golden Kanjur Fragments in the Collection of the IOM, RAS*, “Written Monuments of the Orient” 1, pp. 85–105.
- Ayscough, Samuel, 1782, *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the British Museum Hitherto Undescribed*, Vol. II, Printed for the compiler by J. Rivington, jun., London.
- BCRD, *The Buddhist Canons Research Database. A Project of the American Institute of Buddhist Studies (AIBS) and the Columbia University Center for Buddhist Studies (CCBS)*. Accessed July 3, 2019. <<http://databases.aibs.columbia.edu/>>.
- Bell, John, 1763, *Travels from St. Petersburg in Russia to Diverse Parts of Asia*, 2 vols, Robert and Andrew Foulis, Glasgow.
- Elverskog, Johan (ed.), 2003, *The Jewel Translucent Sūtra: Altan Khan and the Mongols in the Sixteenth Century*, Brill's Inner Asian Library, Vol. 8, Brill, Leiden, Boston.
- Hackett, Paul G., 2012, *A Catalogue of the Comparative Kangyur (Bka'-'gyur dpe bsdur ma)*, Treasury of the Buddhist Sciences Series, American Institute of Buddhist Studies, New York.
- Heissig, Walther, 1954a, *Die Pekinger lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache: Materialien zur mongolischen Literaturgeschichte*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

- 1954b, *Zur geistigen Leistung der neubekehrten Mongolen des späten 16. und frühen 17. Jhdts.*, “Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher” XXVI (1–2), pp. 101–16.
- 1957, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Mongolischen Kandjur-Redaktion der Ligdan Khan-Zeit (1628–1629)*, in: *Studia Altaica. Festschrift für Nikolaus Poppe zum 60. Geburtstag am 8. August 1957*, Studia Altaica, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, pp. 71–87.
- 1959, *Die Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Mongolen. Teil I: 16.–18. Jahrhundert*, Asiatische Forschungen, Band 5, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- 1961, *Eine kleine mongolische Klosterbibliothek aus Tsakhar*, “Jahrbuch des Bernischen Historischen Museums in Bern 1959–1960” XXXIX–XL, pp. 557–590.
- 1962, *Beiträge zur Übersetzungsgeschichte des mongolischen buddhistischen Kanons*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Folge 3, No. 50, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- 1966, *Die mongolische Steininschrift und Manuskriptfragmente aus Olon süme in der Inneren Mongolei*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Folge 3, No 63, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- 1979, *Die erste mongolische Handschrift in Deutschland*, “Zentralasiatische Studien” 13, pp. 191–214.
- 1998, *Some Remarks on the Question of the First Translation of the Mongolian Kandjur*, in: *Essays on Mongol Studies. Commemorative Volume to the 70 Year Birthday of Academician Sh. Bira*, Olon ulsyn mongol sudlalyn holboo, Ulaanbaatar, pp. 155–160.
- Helman-Ważny, Agnieszka, Liubov Kriakina, and Alexander Zorin, 2015, *The First Tibetan Leaves Acquired by the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences: Conservation Issues, Content and Paper Analysis*, “Written Monuments of the Orient” 2, pp. 61–67.
- Yampol’skaya, Natalia, 2015, *Svodnyi perechen’ fragmentov rukopisei ‘chernykh’ mongol’skikh gandzhurov v kollektzii IVR RAN*, “Mongolica” XV, pp. 48–58.
- Kas’yanenko, Zoya K., 1993, *Katalog peterburgskogo rukopisnogo “Gandzhura”*, “Pamyatniki pis’mennosti Vostoka” CII, Bibliotheca Buddhica XXXIX, “Nauka”, Izdatel’skaya firma “Vostochnaya literatura”, Moskva.
- Knüppel, Michael, 2014, *Vom Irtysh nach Kassel: zum Problem der ersten mongolischen und tibetischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, Schriften der Universitätsbibliothek Kassel 12, Kassel Univ. Press, Kassel.
- Kollmar-Paulenz, Karénina, 2001, *Erdeni tunumal neretü sudur: die Biographie des Altan qaghan der Tümed-Mongolen: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der religionspolitischen Beziehungen zwischen der Mongolei und Tibet im ausgehenden 16. Jahrhundert*, Asiatische Forschungen, Bd. 142, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- 2002, *The Transmission of the Mongolian Kanjur: A Preliminary Report*, in: Helmut Eimer and 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*, Brill, Leiden, Boston, Köln, pp. 151–176.
- 2017, *The Mongolian Kanjur – Some Remarks about the Current State of Research*, in: S. Chuluun (ed.) *Mongol Ganzhuur: olan ulsyn sudalгаа*, Shinzhlekh ukhaany akademi, Tüükh, arkheologiyin khüreeen, Ulaanbaatar, pp. 17–36.
- Ligeti, Louis, 1942–1944, *Catalogue du Kanjur Mongol imprimé: Catalogue*, Vol. I, Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica, III, Société Kőrösi Csoma, Budapest.
- Monier-Williams, Monier, 1899, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*, revised by E. Leumann, C. Cappeller, et al, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Nadelyaev, V. M., D. M. Nasilov, È. R. Tenishev, and A. M. Sccherbak (eds.), 1969, *Drevnetyurkskiy Slovar’*, Izdatel’stvo “Nauka”, Leningradskoe otdeleniye, Leningrad.
- Poppe, Nicholas, 1938, *Mongol’skiy Slovar’ Mukaddimat Al-Adab. Chast’ I–II*, Trudy Instituta Vostokovedeniya, XIV, Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moskva, Leningrad.

- Rintchen (ed.), 1959, *Sumatiratna*, Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum, VI–VII, Ulsyn Khevlel, Ulaanbaatar.
- RKTS, *Resources for Kanjur & Tanjur Studies*, Accessed April 12, 2018. <<https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/sub/index.php>>.
- Sárközi, Alice, 1982, *A 17th Century Mongol Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti with Commentary*, “Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae” 36 (1/3), pp. 449–468.
- 2010, *Mongolian Buddhist Terminology over the Ages*, “Rocznik Orientalistyczny”, *Altaica et Tibetica: Anniversary Volume Dedicated to Stanisław Godziński on His Seventieth Birthday* LXIII (1), pp. 215–223.
- Scott, Edward J. L., 1904, *Index to the Sloane Manuscripts in the British Museum*, British Museum, London.
- Weiers, Michael, 1969, *Untersuchungen zu einer historischen Grammatik des präklassischen Schriftmongolisch*, Asiatische Forschungen 28, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Weston, David, 2018, *The Bayer Collection. A Preliminary Catalogue of the Manuscripts and Books of Professor Theophilus Siegfried Bayer; Acquired and Augmented by the Reverend Dr Heinrich Walther Gerdes, Now Preserved in the Hunterian Library of the University of Glasgow*, University of Glasgow, Glasgow.
- Wolf-Dieter, Otte, 1986, *Kataloge der Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel. Die neueren Handschriften der Gruppe Extravagantes*, Teil 1, A Extrav, – 90 Extrav, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main.
- Yampolskaya, Natalia, 2015, *A Note on Foliation in Mongolian Pothi Manuscripts*, “Rocznik Orientalistyczny” LXVIII (2), pp. 258–265.
- 2017, *Fragments of Three Mongolian Kanjur Manuscripts in Russian and European Collections*, in: S. Chuluun (ed.), *Mongol Ganzhuur: Olan Ulsyn Sudalgaa*, Shinzhlekh ukhaany akademi, Tüükh, arkheologiyn khüreelel, Ulaanbaatar, pp. 61–72.
- Zorin, Alexander, 2015, *The History of the First Tibetan Texts Acquired by the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences in the 18th Century*, “Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies” 19, pp. 184–142.