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by Baron A von Staël-Holstein

In the writings of modern scholars only two printed Peking editions of
the Tibetan Kanjur have, as far as I know, been described. One of them
was published in A. D. 1410, and the other one in A. D. 1700\(^1\). The
Prussian State Library possesses thirty six volumes belonging to the A.
D. 1410 edition\(^2\), but no complete copy of it is definitely known to have
survived anywhere.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) This statement is now known to be inaccurate on both counts. The volumes
which were in the Prussian State Library (they were destroyed during the Second
World War) seem [or seemed to me previously] to have belonged to the 1606
Wan-li print, not the 1410 Yung-lo, and at least two complete copies of the
Yung-lo do in fact survive. See my "Notes on the History of the Yongle Kanjur,"
in M. Hahn, R. Steiner, and J.-U. Hartmann, eds., *Suhrllekhā: Festgabe für
Helmut Eimer*. Indica et Tibetica 28 (Swisttal-Odendorf, Germany: Indica et
Tibetica Verlag 1996): 153-200. See now also OCHI Junji 越智淳仁, "Sera-ji, Eirakuban to Depun-ji, Ritanban ni tsuite" セラ寺・永楽版と徳掲寺・リ
タン版について *The Sera Yung-lo and the Drepung Lithang*, *Nihon Chibetto
that in preparing my 1996 paper I overlooked another publication on the Yung-lo
the contents of which, however, do not appear to add to what I have published.
See UEDA Chitoshi 上田千年, "Chibetto Daizōkyō Shohan no Keifu (1): Eiraku­
ban Kangyuru ni kanshite" 《時流大藏経諸版の系譜 (1): 永楽版カンギュルに
に関して》 [Lineages of Various Printings of the Tibetan Canon 1: The Yung-lo
Kanjur], *Bukkyō Daigaku Daigakuin Kiyo* 佛教学大学大学院紀要 22 (1994):
1-17. (I should note that now, in letters of 24 Sept. and 12 Oct., 1998, Dr
Helmut Eimer informs me that at least one of the volumes in the Prussian State
Library did not, in fact, come from the Wan-li, since it is printed in red. He will
publish some research results of his study of this material in the near future.)

I take this opportunity to list a few corrections to my 1996 article, some of
them courtesy of my friend Karashima Seishi 卡里篤史: 163, n. 33, and 175, l.
8 from the bottom 遷→遷; 175, last line, and 176 first line: 微→微; 186, l. 4
from bottom:彌→彌; 175, l. 3, punctuate ... 化導群類。非上 ...; line 6,
punctuate 蔵。此... 186, l. 7, punctuate ... 厥事。蓋仁慈 ... Several other
 corrections can be made on the basis of a photocopy of the first two pages of
the original Chinese text of the *Yü-chih tsang-ching ch’ih-yü* 御製藏經動論
kindly sent me by Prof. Ochi; 186, l. 3: delete 四; l. 7: 甘→甘; l. 16: 續→續.
These two pages end at line 18; there must be a third page, the original of which
I have not seen. Also correct: 158, n. 16: the listing of the leaves with the
Yung-lo is Ochi’s error, clarified in his 1997 paper, p. 24; 192, l. 1: Hakuyu >
Hakuyū; Hadano 1974b seems not to exist, or at least the reference is wrong.
The Yung Ho Kung (雍和宮) lamasery of Peking has all the 106 volumes forming the A.D. 1700 edition, a catalogue of which by Mr. B. Sakurabe, has lately (1930-1932) been published by the Ōtani Daigaku Library (大谷大学所圖書館). The document reproduced on plate II below proves that another edition of the Tibetan Kanjur was completed in Peking in A.D. 1692. I suggest the following translation of the Tibetan text of the document.

b. Sakurabe Bunkyō 櫻部文鏡. *A Comparative Analytical Catalogue of the Kanjur Division of the Tibetan Tripitaka / Ōtani Daigaku Toshokan Zō: Chibetto Daizōkyō Kanjūrō Kandō Mokuroku,* 3 volumes (Kyoto: Ōtani Daigaku Toshokan 大谷大學圖書館, 1930-32). This actually catalogues the 1717/20 print, and not the 1700 print.

c. The postface, which was apparently attached to every volume of the set, reads as follows:

// Om swa sti pra dza bhyih
sngon spyad bsod nams las 'khrungs chu gter las /
/ rmad byung thugs rje'i brlabs 'phreng cher g-yos te /
/ nam yang zad med smon lam si tā'i * klung /
/ snyigs dus skye 'gro'i bsod nams zhi mgchos tu /
/ babs pa'i bskal bzang gser gyi snye ma'i 'bras /
/ legs par smin pa'i mdo sde'i bka 'gyur 'di /
/ dpaldan * 'phags pa'i lha khang 'khrungs kau si'i /
/ dge long sbyin pa rgya mtho gtsos mdzad ba'i /
/ apon slob tshogs kyi lhag bsam dag pa'i mthus /
/ gnas bskos gser mngal khang hi gser gyi * khrir /
/ ri rab lhun po'i lta bu brian gyur cig [V]
/ dge 'dis bdag sogs rgyu sbyor sbyin bdag dang /
/ pha ma gtsos byas 'gro drug sms can nans /
/ gnas ngan len gyi 'ching ba * las grol te /
/ sangs rgyas zhi ng myur du skye bar shog /
/ thub bstan spyi dang 'jam mgon tsong kha pa'i /
/ chos srid zung la dbang bsgyur mes po yi /
/ sku tshe mnga' thang srid mthar * rgyas pa dang /
/ bkra shing bde legs dpal la sphyod par shog /
/ dza yantu / ta'i ching khar [read: khang] hi lo sum cu so gcig chu pho sprel lo
/ snrul gyi zla ba'i chu pho khyi rgyal gyi nyi ma la dbu gtsugs * nas mon gru zla
/ ba'i sa pho stag dga' ba nyi ma'i bar du legs par bsgrubs pa'o /

Thanks to Prof. Akamatsu Akihiko 赤松明彦, I have now seen a copy of Manasarowara (so read) 1, the only number ever published, which however does not contain any article on the Yung-lo Kanjur. Most of this privately distributed journal, published by the Chibetto Butken Kenkyūkai チベット仏典研究会 (Tibetan Buddhist Text Society) of Sendai, is devoted to studies of the Lāravātārā-sūtra. (With respect to p. 163, n. 33, Karashima also informed me of the Chinese term 壽符, which means "to engrave.")
This [is the] Kanjur [composed] of sūtras – rice-grains of an auspicious golden ear, which have developed because an uninterrupted Sitā river of prayers flowing in a great row of wonderful mercy-waves from a lake arisen out of merit [acquired in] former [existences] has irrigated (literally: flown into) the most excellent Punyakṣetra^4 of the Kaliyuga.

May the purity of the intentions [adhyāṣayaśuddhi] of the community of masters and pupils headed by Sbyin pa rgya mtsho [Dānasāgara?] a Dge slong [Bhikṣu, attached] to the illustrious 'Phags pa [Lama’s] temple, the Ch’ung Kuo Ssū^5, serve to keep the gold-born^6 Emperor K’ang Hsi, Sumeru-like in firmness [sitting] on his golden throne.

May the good [deed which I have done in editing the Kanjur] liberate me as well as the other benefactors connected with this matter (i.e. the Kanjur edition), and all the living beings of the six classes, first of all [my] parents, from the fetters of sin^7, and may [we all, owing to the good deed] soon be born in Buddha fields.

May the powerful realm of the venerable patriarch^8, who governs Buddhism (thub bstan) in general and the church of Mañjunātha Tsong kha pa [in particular], be extended to the limits [of the world] and may it enjoy happiness and well-being.

[The edition of the Kanjur] was begun on the chu pho khyi rgyal (male water «2» dog victory) day of the snrul month of the chu pho sprel (male water ape) year [which coincides with] the 31st year of the K’ang Hsi period [A. D. 1692] of the Ta Ch’ing dynasty, and [the edition of the Kanjur] was well finished on the sa pho stag dga’ ba (male earth tiger joy) day of the mon gru^9 month [of the same year?].

Several copies of this document were found in different volumes of my own almost complete copy of the Tibetan Kanjur, and I have no doubt that the volumes which I possess were printed in A. D. 1692. The Sung Chu Ssū (癉祝寺) lamasery of Peking possesses a set of the A. D. 1692 Kanjur, which seems^10 to be quite complete, and we are therefore able to compare the two editions (A. D. 1692 and A. D. 1700).

The volumes of the A. D. 1692 edition are numbered as follows: KA-A (30 volumes), KŠA (1 volume), KI-I (30 volumes), KU-U (30 volumes), and KE-PHE (14 volumes), altogether 105 volumes. In the A. D. 1700 edition too we find volumes marked KA-A, KŠA, KI-I, KU-U, and KE-PHE, but the A. D. 1700 editors considered the inclusion of the Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud,^12 which fills an entire volume in the Kanjur, necessary, and added one volume to the 105 volumes of the A. D. 1692 edition. As a result of this addition the A. D. 1700 Kanjur has 106 volumes.^13 For some reason the A. D. 1700 editors thought that the proper place for the newly added volume was between the volumes ZHA and 'A. Therefore they marked the volume containing the Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud with the character ZA.^14 The work (Bu ston’s collection of dhāraṇīs), which occupied the volume ZA in the A. D. 1692 ed. is
marked OM in the A. D. 1700 ed. and regarded as the superior first volume of the Rgyud division of the Kanjur. On plate III below page 55a of Bu ston’s collection as it appears in the A. D. 1692 and in the A. D. 1700 Kanjurs is reproduced. The A. D. 1692 edition of the page is marked Rgyud ZA nga lnga gong and the A. D. 1700 edition of the page bears the following marks: Rgyud OM nga lnga gong and the A. D. 1700 Kanjur.

As far as I can see, the same blocks were used for printing the two editions of the volume, and I believe that the markings at the sides of the pages were changed by a process, which the old style printers of Peking still apply when correcting their blocks. The faulty parts of the blocks are removed and new pieces of wood for the emendations are fitted into the resulting cavities. In the same way thousands of corrections seem to have been effected in other volumes of the A. D. 1700 ed. On line 8 of page 12b of volume CHU, for instance, the A. D. 1700 ed. has nyi ma zla ba sgron ma instead of the syllables nyi ma ma mtsho na ma (?), which we find in the A. D. 1692 edition. The Skt. text of the Saddharmapundarīkasūtra (ed. by Kern and Nanjio, Bibl. Buddhica X, page 25, line 1) has candrārkadipa in the corresponding verse and supports the A. D. 1700 emendation. The following readings of the A. D. 1700 edition likewise agree with the Skt. version of the sūtra published in the Bibliotheca Buddhica. CHU 120a 7: rgyal po’i zhab ring (Skt., page 279, line 1: rājapurūṣaḥ, A. D. 1692: rgyal po’i zham rim). CHU 145a 3: spos mar gyi mar me dag gis (Skt., page 337, line 7: gandhatailapradīpair, A. D. 1692: spos mar gyi me dag gis). CHU 145a 8: mtshan nyid du rig par bya’o (Skt., page 338, 1: laksanam veditavyam, A. D. 1692: mtsham nyid

---


e. According to the Tibetan texts edited by NAKAMURA Zuiryū 中村瑞隆 et al., “Chibetto-yaku Hokekyō” チベット訳法華経, Hokke Bunka Kenkyū 法華文化研究 2 [1976] and following. Page numbers equal those of the Sanskrit edition of KERN & NANJIO 1908-12), Cone, Derge, Lhasa and Narthang [denoted by NAKAMURA C, D, L, N] read zhab’s bring. (It may be worthwhile mentioning that while NAKAMURA’s edition of “the” Tibetan of the Lotus Sūtra – which takes as its base the highly problematic Peking edition, and records variants from only Cone, Derge, Narthang and Lhasa – is convenient, from a text-critical point of view it is of extremely limited utility. It is a real shame that, even for such an important sūtra, we still have no reliable account of the Tibetan tradition’s transmission of the text.).
The A. D. 1700 editors have not confined their efforts to correcting mistakes like these in their version of volume '1, but have added an entire sūtra, the Bhadrapālaśreṣṭhiparipṛcchā (A. D. 1700 ed., vol '1, pages 50b-73b) not found in the A. D. 1692 edition to it. Another work, which is missing in the A. D. 1692 edition is the Vidyutprāptaparipṛcchā (A. D. 1700 ed., vol. ZHI, pages 333b-350a). Both sūtras belong to the Mahāratnakūtaḍharmaparyāya, a collection containing 49 (in the A. D. 1692 ed.: 47) works. The inclusion of the Vidyutprāptaparipṛcchā and

f. According to NAKAMURA, CDLN read de bzhin gshegs pas ji skad gsungs pa bzhin yang dag pa ji lta ba bzhin du.


h. These are all confirmed by the sTog Palace Kanjur, dkon brtsegs, cha: §8, sTog 207a2; §94, sTog 229b5: §105, sTog 233a3; §139, sTog 241b2; §144, sTog 243a3.

i. See note 98 of my “Notes on the History of the Yongle Kanjur.” Both texts are also missing from the copy of the Yung-lo Kanjur of which Tada Tōkan 多田等観 listed the contents in Sera monastery in 1924 (for which see note 17 of the article just mentioned). However, a number of other texts are also missing
of the Bhadrapālaśreṣṭhiparipṛcchā, which are absent from the A. D. 1692 ed., in the A. D. 1700 ed. necessitated the addition of 17 leaves to volume ZHI (A. D. 1692: 333 leaves, A. D. 1700: 350 leaves) and of 23 leaves to volume 'I (A. D. 1692: 288 leaves, A. D. 1700: 311 leaves). On plate VIII below page 50b of volume 'I is reproduced as it appears in the two editions. In the A. D. 1692 edition we find the end of the Sarvabhuddhamahārahasyaupāyākauśalyājñānottarabodhisattvaparipṛcchāparivarīta and the beginning of the Dārikavimalaśraddhāparipṛcchā on page 'I 50b. In the A. D. 1700 edition, however, the beginning of the Bhadrapālaśreṣṭhiparipṛcchā takes the place, which the beginning of the Dārikavimalaśraddhāparipṛcchā occupied in the A. D. 1692 edition.

The Berlin manuscript and the A. D. 1692 xylograph are the only Kanjurs known to me which omit the Vidyutprāptaparipṛcchā as well as the Bhadrapālaśreṣṭhiparipṛcchā. The A. D. 1692 edition has many other features in common with the volumes described by Beckh, and the similarity of the two collections may some day help to solve the mystery, which still surrounds the Berlin manuscript Kanjur.

Notes to the article On a Peking Edition of the Tibetan Kanjur which Seems to be Unknown in the West

Note 1.
Prince 福全 (Fu Ch’üan) occupies the first place among the members of a committee whom the Emperor had ordered to prepare a complemented edition of the Tibetan Kanjur. Comp. the document dated K’ang Hsi 39 [=A.D. 1700] which is reprinted on pages 10-11 of the Ōtani cat.

(dkon brtsegs 7, 11, 20, 33, 39, 42), and since Tada did not list folio numbers, it is impossible to be certain what was lost and what was not included at all. I am very grateful to Prof. Kitamura Hajime 北村 甫, Director of the Tōyō Bunko, for kindly sending me a photocopy of Tada’s handwritten list.

j. “hasya-upāya” should be written “hasya-upāya”; it does not indicate the dipthong.


l. On Fu Ch’üan, see Arthur William HUMMEL, Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing Period, 1644-1912 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office 1943): 251-52, which, however, mentions only his military and political career.
introd. It should be noted that the scholar who was at the head of the A.D. 1692 Kanjur committee, the Dge slong [Bhikṣu] Sbyin pa rgya mtsho [Dānasāgara?], is not mentioned in the document among the numerous collaborators of the Prince. This omission probably means that Sbyin pa rgya mtsho’s work as chief editor was not approved by the court. Prince Fu Ch’üan would hardly have ignored his predecessor’s editorial activities, if the latter had simply disappeared without incurring Imperial disfavour.

I possess a xylograph of the Mongolian version of the document published in Chinese on pages 10-11 of the Ōtani cat. introd. The Mongolian version says: The editor in chief of the Kanjur, Prince Fu Ch’üan and (here follow the names of over thirty collaborators) have according to the [Imperial] command “complement [the Kanjur] and engrave [the blocks for printing the Kanjur]” completed the engraving [of the blocks for the Kanjur] on a lucky day of the first summer month of the 39th year of K‘ang Hsi (Jarliy iyar núkūjū seyil kemeksen ganjur nom i kūliyen újejū úyiledgegülugsen jasay un elbeg čin wang tūšimel fučiuwan ... engke amuyulang un yučin yisüdüger on u jun u terigün sara yin sayin edir seyilejū tegüsgebe). I am entirely ignorant of the Mongolian language, and I owe this information as well as practically everything else I know about Mongolian documents to the kindness of Mr. B. I. Pankratoff.

In the Tibetan version of the A.D. 1700 (K‘ang Hsi 39) document (xylograph belonging to the National Library of Peking) par bzhengs twice corresponds to the Mongolian seyil which can only mean “to engrave [the texts on the blocks for printing]” in this connection. The expression dpar bzhengs, which we find in the document quoted in note 11 below, must have the same meaning as par bzhengs. I have not found the expression par bzhengs (or dpar bzhengs) in my dictionaries, and I am not quite sure as to what it really means: “to print” or “to engrave.” According to Jaeschke (dict., page 484) bzheng (pf. and imp. bzhengs) alone, without par, means i.a.: “to print.”

m. As I am also entirely ignorant of the Mongolian language, I leave Staël-Holstein’s transcription exactly as it is.

n. Heinrich August JASCHKE, A Tibetan-English Dictionary (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1881). The complications raised by compounds with the term bzhengs have been discussed by HADANO Hakuyū 羽田野伯雑, “Chibetto daizō-kyō engi: ‘Sono ichi’ – Nartan daigakumonji no senkuteki jigyō o megutte”, チベット大蔵経緯・[その一]-ナルタン大学問寺の先駆的業業をめぐって, (A history of the compiling and editing of the Tibetan Buddhist Scriptures, “Bkah-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur”: part 1: the pioneering work of Narhang monas-
In transliterating the Tibetan characters I use the system adopted in the Bibliotheca Buddhica, vol. XV, page XI.\(^6\)

**Note 2.**
Comp. Grünwedel’s *Mythologie*, page 74.\(^7\) Two block-printed documents in my possession, which were evidently printed with Ming dynasty blocks, refer to the Tibetan Kanjur. One of them is a postface composed by the Emperor Yung Le in Tibetan and in Chinese, and the other one is an ode in which the same Emperor sings the Kanjur’s praises in the two languages. Both documents are dated. The postface bears only one date: the 9\(^{th}\) day of the 3\(^{rd}\) month of the 8\(^{th}\) year (A.D. 1410) of Yung Le, but on the last page of the Chinese version of the ode we find two dates: the Yung Le date just mentioned and a note, from which we learn that the Kanjur (or perhaps the Imperial ode only) had been re-engraved (重刊) during the reign of the Emperor Wan Li, who died in A.D. 1620.\(^8\) The Tibetan version of the ode omits the Wan Li note. Comp. plate I below.

On page 41 of his *商務印書館出版年表* (Commercial Press, Shanghai, 1933) Mr. Lü (呂) takes it for granted that a Wan Li edition (萬曆版) of the Kanjur did (or does) exist, without, however, indicating the source of his information.\(^9\) I am indebted to Mr. Yü (于道泉) for having drawn my attention to Mr. Lü’s book.\(^5\)

\(^{1}\) As stated in the Introduction, I have modified this system.


\(^{3}\) For a detailed discussion of the Yung-lo edition, refer to my “Notes on the History of the Yongle Kanjur.” Note that Staël-Holstein has misunderstood the term '重刊'. It here means reprint, not re-engraving. See, however, the same expression in my paper, note 38, where the meaning is as Staël-Holstein here understood it.


\(^{5}\) Yü Tao-ch’üan was a scholar of Tibetan Buddhism who published such works as the Love Songs of the Sixth Dalai Lama (Peking: Academia Sinica 1930). See *Bibliographie Bouddhique IV-V* (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve 1934): §125 (p. 52).
Note 3.
The Tibetan text is preceded by the Sanskrit syllables om svasti pradzabhyih (read: pradzābhyaḥ), om hail to [all] creatures. On the sixth line we find another Sanskrit expression: dza yantu, may they be victorious. The eighth line of our document is in Chinese. It states that Sbyin pa rgya mtsho, a Dge slong [attached] to the Peking (京都, the capital) Ch’ung Kuo Ssū, having resolved [to become a Buddha] printed, or engraved the blocks for printing [印造] [the Kanjur] on the first day of the second summer [month] of the 31st year of the K’ang Hsi [period] of the Ta Ch’ing [dynasty]. The expression 發菩提心 which is the usual rendering of Skt. bodhicittotpāda etc. is very frequently shortened to 發心 in Chinese Buddhist books. Comp. page 37 of my edition of the commentary to the Kāśyapaṇaparivarta, where 發心 corresponds to byang chub kyi sems (b)skyed de [bodhicittam utpādayati]. 發心印造 could of course also mean: he formed the resolve to print, or to engrave the blocks for printing. I do not adopt this translation of the four characters here because we are dealing with a postface containing a typically Buddhistic parināmanā, or dedication of religious merit. The fact that the Emperor is mentioned in the first dedicating stanza of our document suggests that the A.D. 1692 ed., like the A.D. 1700 ed., was issued under Imperial auspices. I learn from Professor Y. K. Tschen that the expression 發心 frequently occurs in Buddhistic colophons. Comp. pages 449b and 514a of the 敦煌劫錄編 in 1931 by the Academia Sinica. «7»

t. The Chinese reads 大清康熙參拾壹年仲夏朔日京都崇國寺格龍印吧監佐發心印造.
v. Ch'en Yüan 陳垣, Tun-huang chieh-yü lu 敦煌劫餘錄 [An analytical list of the Tun-huang manuscripts in the National Library of Pei-p'ing]. Kuo-li Chung-yang yen-chiu-yüan li-shih yü-yen yen-chiu-so chuan-k' an 國立中央研究院歷史語言研究所專刊 4 (Pei-p'ing: Kuo-li Chung-yang yen-chiu-yüan li-shih yü-yen yen-chiu-so 國立中央研究院歷史語言研究所 1931). This was recently reprinted in volumes 3 and 4 of Huang Yung-wu 黃永武 ed., Tun-huang ts'ung-k' an ch' u-chi 敦煌叢刊初集 (Taipei: Hsin-wen-feng ch' u-pan-shé 新文豐出版社 1985). The manuscripts referred to by Staël-Holstein are 麗 74, the 佛說迦葉向輪經, and 字 45, the 佛說迦葉王授記勸修七齋功德經.
Note 4.

Comp. note No 14 on page 11 of my article "On a Tibetan text translated into Sanskrit under Ch'ien Lung (XVIII cent.) and into Chinese under Tao Kuang (XIX cent.)," Bulletin of the National Library of Peiping, July-August 1932.

The word Punyakṣetra (bsod nams zhing) may evidently be used in the sense of "a holy field" (which is irrigated by the waters of a river) as well as in the sense of "a saint" (who is moved by the prayers of the pious). Rice (ˈbras) fields have to be more copiously irrigated, than most other fields. The sūtra-rice grains may therefore be regarded as having developed because (I read babs pas instead of babs pa'i) the prayer-river has flown into the Punyakṣetra.

The poet evidently suggests that the Kanjur is comparable to an ear containing many grains (which in the case of the Kanjur are represented by sūtras, the contents of the Kanjur).

According to S. C. Das (dict., page 1268) Sitā (read: Sitā) is "the Sanskrit name of the great river of Tibet." According to Böhtlingk (dict., vol. VI, page 130) Sitā is a "Beiname" of the Ganges. In any case the name designates a mighty stream.

According to the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, the eight great rivers (八大河, chu klung chen po bgyad) are: (1) 恒河, in the Tib. text: gang gā. (2) 頰摩羅, yam pa la. (3) 薩羅, sal (or sa la?). (4) 阿梨羅跋提, a la la bar ta. (5) 摩訶, mahā. (6) 尋頭, sin du. (7) 博叉, bag (or pag) sha. (8) 悉陀, si ta. Comp. Taishō Trip. XII 381 b, and the A. D. 1692 Kanjur, vol. JU, page 45b. This Tibetan translation of the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra is
based upon a Chinese version, not upon a Skt. original. Comp. the Ōtani catalogue, page 287 and Pelliot’s Notes à propos d’un catalogue du Kanjur (Journ. As., Juillet-Aout 1914, page 130).aa The Chinese translation was made under the Pei Liang dynasty (397-439), comp. Nanjio No. 113.

Another Tibetan version of the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, which is based upon a Sanskrit original gives us the names of four great rivers (Gaṅgā, Yamunā, Sarayu and Hiṅgula) only in the corresponding passage. Comp. the A.D. 1692 Kanjur, vol. TU, page 42a, line 8.

According to Boethlingk and Roth’s dictionary Sitā (long ī) frequently occurs as the name of a river in the Mahābhārata, etc.ab

From the 勝鬘窟窟 we learn that the 悉陀 (= Sitā or Sītā) river flows out of the mouth of a horse’s head (made of vaidūrya, 瑠璃) fixed to the western part of the Anavatapta lake. Comp. the Taishō Trip. vol. 37, page 43b, line 2.ac Comp. also page 377c (line 25) of volume 35 of the Taishō Trip.ad

Mr. Pankratoff tells me that the Mongolian translation of our document (reproduced on plate II below) is, on the whole, not quite satisfactory. In some cases, however, I have accepted the Mongolian translator’s interpretations. He renders bskal «b» bzang by saying Zubitu (meaning: auspi-
cious), which, according to the dictionaries, is an equivalent of skal bzang (subhaga), not of bskal bzang (bhadrakalpa). I think he is right in ignoring the prefixed b, which we find in our document, and I follow his example in this case.

The Tanjur codices, which Beckh used for this edition of the Meghadūta, too have bskal bzang (not skal bzang) for subhaga in at least two passages. Comp. Die Tibetische Übersetzung von Kālidāsas Meghadūta von Hermann Beckh, Berlin, 1907, pages 30 and 33.

Note 5.
We learn from the Chinese line in our document that the Dge slong (格龍) Sbyin pa rgya mtsho (印吧監佐) of the temple called Ch’ung Kuo Ssū (崇國寺) was responsible for the A. D. 1692 Kanjur. Sbyin pa rgya mtsho himself is evidently the author of the stanzas translated above (page 1), and this may account for the fact that he appears as a mere Bhikṣu in the A.D. 1692 document. In an A.D. 1734 document issued by the Pañchen Lama Blo bzang ye shes dpal bzang po the latter is also designated as a mere Bhikṣu. Comp. my article “Notes sur un décret du Pan-chen Lama daté de 1734,” which appeared in the Politique de Pékin (1925).ae Sbyin pa rgya mtsho must have been an important personage, but I have not succeeded in finding his name in the Chinese or Tibetan books, which I have examined with the help of numerous Chinese and Tibetan friends. A part of the manuscript K’ang Hsi records, which used to be stored in the Forbidden City of Peking, are now in Shanghai. As soon as these Shanghai manuscripts become accessible (which they are not at present), I shall examine them, and continue my efforts to learn more about Sbyin pa rgya mtsho.af

ae. The article is found on pp. 300-302 of the journal. My thanks are due J.-L. Taffarelli, Librarian of the École Française d’Étrême-Orient, for kindly sending me a copy. The phrase to which Staël-Holstein refers is: shākya’i dge slong blo bzang ye shes dpal bzang po.


Thanks to the very kind information of Gene Smith, I can now add the following:

The Tibetan syllables Khrungs gau si are evidently a transliteration of the Chinese characters 崇國寺 (Ch’ung Kuo Ssü). Comp. above note 3. None of the Chinese sources which I have consulted connects the illustrious 'Phags pa with a Peking (京都, capital) temple called Ch’ung Kuo Ssü. There seem to have been several temples in Peking which at a time or another bore that name. One of them is the present 大隆善護國寺 (a Lama temple), which according to the 53rd chapter of the 順定日下舊聞考 was repaired during the reign of the Emperor Khubilai (至元).

According to Köppen’s Religion des Buddha (II, 97), the 'Phags pa (born in A. D. 1233) was recognized as the head of Lamaism by Khubilai. In the 6th chapter of the 八千卷樓書目 we find the statement that the 順定日下舊聞考 was written in the 39th year of Ch’ien Lung.

Note 6.

I suppose that gser mngal is used here for gser mngal can, which according to S. C. Das (dict., page 1311) is an equivalent of Skt, hiranyagarbha. This word is an epithet of the god Brahmā, who is said to have been born from a golden egg. Mallinātha’s commentary to line 1 of canto 1 of the Śiṣุpāla-vadha says: hiranyasya garbho hiranyagarbho brahmā brahmāṇḍaprabhavatvāt.

263: zhe drug pa spyin pa rgya mtsho ni / bka’ ‘gyur lung tshang ma dar bar mdzad pas bka’ ‘gyur pa zhes grags /.] He was from Qinghai and had close relations with the Manchu. Bsam blo is one of his many titles derived from his college affiliation; he is also called Ngag dbang dpal bzang, and Bka’ ‘gyur Sbyin pa rgya mtsho. The fact that he is called Bka’ ‘gyur ba makes a strong case that it was this Dga’ ldan Khri who was responsible for the carving of this Peking edition. Probably Sbyin pa rgya mtsho was in Peking until 1692 when he was named to the throne of Dga’ ldan. He was then replaced by the Second Lcang skya in Peking in 1693. See the chronology in the Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo (Zhang Yisun 張怡蘋 [Peking: Min-tsu ch’u-pan-shé 民族出版社 1985]: 3271: 1692: Chos rje bka’ ‘gyur ba sbyin pa rgya mtsho dga’ ldan khrir phebs, and 1693: Gong ma khang shis lcang skya nag dbang chos ldan pe cin du gdan drangs.)


ai. The correct date is 1235.

aj. In the standard edition of 1923 the reference is on page 7a of chüan 6 (史部, 地理類).
Note 7.
According to the *Mahāvyutpatti* (Sakaki ed., No 8424 and No 8473) *gnas ngan len* = *duṣṭhula.* This Sanskrit word means "ein arges Vergehen," according to Schmidt's "Nachträge zum Sanskrit-Wörterbuch," page 214.

Note 8.
The venerable patriarch mentioned here is probably the Great Fifth (*Inga pa chen po*) Dalai Lama, who was supposed to be still alive in 1692, but who had actually died in 1682. Comp. Köppen, *die Religion des Buddha*, vol. II, pages 173, 174 and 185. On a Tibetan document (No 245 of my collection) issued by the XIII Dalai Lama in 1909 (*sa bya*) we find a seal impression with legends in four languages (Mongolian, Manchu, Tibetan, and Chinese). The Tibetan and Chinese legends read as follows: *Nub phyogs mchog tu dge ba'i zhis gi rgyal dbang sa steng gi rgyal bstan yongs kyi bdag po thams cad mkhyen pa badzra dha ra tâ la'i bla ma'i tham ba.* 西天大善自在佛所領天下釋教普通瓦赤拉咱喇達達額喇嘛之印. These legends prove that the XIII Dalai Lama like the patriarch of the A.D. 1692 document claimed to be the master of universal (not only Tibetan) Buddhism. This claim which has certainly never been recognized by the majority of Singhalese, Burmese, Siamese, Annamite, Corean and Japanese Buddhists was evidently supported by the Peking court. In the heading of the 1909 document (*Gong ma'i lung gis nub phyogs mchog tu dge ba'i zhis gi rgyal dbang sa steng gi rgyal bstan yongs kyi bdag po thams cad mkhyen pa badzra dha ra ta [sic] la'i bla mar 'bod pa'i gtam*) the XIII Dalai Lama affirms that it is by Imperial command that he bears the title engraved on his seal. According to the 15th chapter of the *衛藏通志*, the Emperor in 1724 (Yung Cheng 2) granted the Dalai Lama a seal bearing the following inscription in Manchu, Mongolian, Chinese, and Tangut (唐古忒): 西天自在佛總理天下釋教普通日 [sic] 赤拉坦喇達
Only the Chinese text of the inscription is given in the Wei Tsang T'ung Chih.\(^\text{am}\)

The name of the great reformer is spelt Tsong kha pa here as well as in many other Tibetan documents. There are, however, some authors, who call him Btsong kha pa. Comp. pages 4 and 10 of my article quoted in note 4 above.

Note 9.

In the Mongolian version of our document mul corresponds to the syllable snrul of the Tibetan version. Mul is evidently a corruption of Skt. mūla, and mūla (mūlam) \(<10>\) is, according to the Vyuṭpatti (Sakaki ed., No 3203), a name of the 17\(^{\text{th}}\) nakṣatras. The Tibetan name of the nakṣatra called mūla in Skt. is snrubš (not snrul), comp. the Vyutp. I. c., S. C. Das, dict., page 772, and the Skt.-Tib. dict. ed. by Bacot, page 99b.\(^\text{an}\) I have not found the syllable snrul in any of my dictionaries. In the Mongolian version of our document satabis corresponds to the syllables mon grub of the Tibetan version. According to the Vyutp. (Sakaki ed., No 3208 and No 3209), satabhiṣa (Tib. mon gre or mon dre) is the 22\(^{\text{nd}}\) nakṣatra, and dhanīṣṭhā (Tib. mon grub) the 23\(^{\text{rd}}\) nakṣatra. According to S. C. Das, however, mon grub = śathabhiṣa, and mon dre = dhanīṣṭhā. The Skt.-Tib. dict. published by Bacot (page 131b) and the 四體合璧文鑑 (chapter I, page 5b)\(^\text{ao}\) agree with the Vyutp. as to the Skt. equivalents of mon grub (dhanīṣṭhā, danista) and mon gre (satabhiṣa, satabis).\(^\text{ao}\) Copies of the

am. The Wei-tsang t'ung-chih 衛藏通志, printed in 1896, was reprinted by Li Yü-shu 李毓澍 (Taipei: Wen-hai ch'u-pan-shè 文海出版社 1965), in the series Chung-kuo pien-chiang shu 第一輯 15. The cited passage is found in chūan 15, 1b (my punctuation): 雍正二年。欽鸞達賴喇嘛金冊金 寶其印文曰。西天自在佛總理天下釋教普通日赤拉坦喇達賴喇嘛之印。清 字蒙古字漢字唐古忒字四種篆文.


ao. I do not have access to the cited work, but in the Wu-t'i Ch'ing-wên-chien edited in Gotai Shinbunkan Yakkai 五體清文鑑譯解 (Tamura Jitsuzō 田村實 造, Imanishi Shunjū 今西春秋, and Satō Hisashi 佐藤長, eds., Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Bungakubu Nairiku Ajia Kenkyūjo 京都大学文学部內陸アジア研究所 1966), mon grub is found as item 92 and mon gre as item 93, with the Mongolian equivalents cited by Staël-Holstein. Note also that snrubś is found as item 87.


I have not met with the Tibetan and Mongolian designations of the months and days, which we find in our document, before. My Lama friends are also not acquainted with them, and I have tried in vain to find the regular equivalents of these unusual expressions with the help of the books available in Peking.

Note 10.
I have not been able to examine the entire Sung Chu Ssū Kanjur myself, but one of my Lama friends, who has the entree of the Sung Chu Ssū library, tells me that the copy is complete and that it shows all the characteristics of the A.D. 1692 edition. The few volumes of the Sung Chu Ssū Kanjur which I have seen confirm my Lama friend’s statements. Comp. my edition of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, Shanghai 1926, page XX.

Note 11.
24 (KA-YA) volumes of the A.D. 1692 edition belong to the Tantra division, the various collections of the Prajñāpāramitā class fill 24 (RA-A, KSA, and KI-TSI) volumes, the Mahāratnakūṭa 6 (TSHI-‘I), the Buddhāvatāraṁsaka 6 (YI-HI), the miscellaneous sūtras, Mdo sna tshogs, 32 (I-KE), and the Vinaya 13 (KHE-PHE). The printed Mongolian Kanjur has 108 volumes. Comp. the 學史叢録, page 282. According to a Chinese table of contents (xylograph belonging to Harvard University), which agrees with the Tibetan table of contents (xylograph belonging to myself), 25 volumes (which include a volume containing Bu ston’s collection of dhāraṇīs, and another volume containing the *Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud*) of the printed Mongolian Kanjur belong to the Tantra division, the

---

Materials for Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionaries 1 (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko 1989), reads only mon gre for śatabhīṣā. However the reading mon dre does appear in several dictionaries, for example the Dge bshes chos kyi grags pas brtsams pa'i brda dag ming tshig gsal ba bzhus so (Peking: Min-tsu ch'u-pan-shé 民族出版社 1981): 650. Note that the Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo (see note af, above), p. 2123, identifies mon gru with śatabhīṣā, and mon gre with dhanīṣṭhā.


ar. I have been unable to identify this work.
various collections of the Prajñāpāramitā «11» class fill 22 volumes, the Mahāratanakūṭa 6, the Buddhāvatāraṇīsaka 6, the miscellaneous sūtras 33, and the Vinaya 16.

The Tibetan table of contents mentioned above is preceded by a lengthy introduction, which is missing in the Chinese version. We learn from this introduction that the editors of the Mongolian Kanjur, who were appointed by the Emperor K'ang Hsi, knew only of manuscript copies of the Mongolian Kanjur (sog yig bka' 'gyur), and we have no reason to believe that they were wrong in regarding the edition which they published as the first printed edition of the Mongolian Kanjur.

An important date mentioned in the introduction is the 19th day of 3rd month of the 56th year after the accession of His Majesty [K'ang Hsi] to the throne which governs the universe (literally: all regions, khyon thams cad). On that day the Emperor K'ang Hsi ordered one of his officers to announce to the venerable monks (bla ma ser mo ba), the Mongolian Princes (sog po'i dbang), Dukes etc. that the Mongolian Kanjur would be engraved on blocks [for printing] (dpar bzhengs). Upon hearing the good news everybody rejoiced as if he had obtained a cintāmaṇi or philosophers' stone (thams cad kyis yid bzhin gyi nor bu rnyed pa lta bu'i dga' bas rjes su yi rangs). The introduction goes on to say that in accordance with the Emperor's orders the existing hand-written Mongolian Kanjur was compared with the Tibetan Kanjur, and that the Mongolian text was revised (zhu dag) by noted scholars, who spoke both languages (skad gnyis smra ba). My xylograph does not tell us when the editing work was finished, but it mentions the Mongolian Kanjur as well engraved (dpar legs par grub pa) at the end of the introduction. This proves that the cutting of the blocks for the Mongolian Kanjur must have been completed not later than the 3rd month of the 59th year of K'ang Hsi [A. D. 1720], which is the date of my xylograph (page 34b, line 5). The latter adds the cyclical designation of the year (lcags byi, iron mouse) to the Chinese date for greater precision. According to Kowalewski's Mongolian Chrestomathy (vol. I, page 264) a Mongolian Kanjur was revised in Peking under Yung Chêng (1723-1736) and printed during the first half of the XVIII century. as Comp. Kazakevich's Russian translation of Laufer's Skizze der mongolischen Literatur, page 54. at

as. The work mentioned is the Mongolskaia khrestomatiia of Osip Mikhailovich KOVALEVSKII (Kazan: V Universitetskoi tipografii 1836). I have not been able to locate a copy of this work.

at. I do not have access to the Russian translation, but the German original is to be
Note 12.
Different titles are ascribed to this work in the Tibetan index (Dkar chag), at the beginning of the text, and in the colophon which says: *Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud phyi ma rdzogs so*. Dr. Laufer (Bulletin de l'Academie Imperiale des Sciences de St. Petersbourg 1909, page 571) mentions this work, and refers his readers to line 2 of page 9a of the XX volume of the Rgyud division of the A. D. 1700 Kanjur, which he saw at Hsi An. The words *ral pa gyen brdzes* do appear on line 2 of page 1a of the XXII (ZA in Tibetan and 二十二 in Chinese) volume of the Rgyud division «12» in the A. D. 1700 Kanjur which the Yung Ho Kung lamasery possesses (not on XX. 9a 2). Comp. page 157 of the Ōtani catalogue, according to which the *Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rtog pa chen po* occupies vol. ZA (祕密經第二十二), and plate IV below, on which the first and the last page of the *Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud* (as they appear in the A. D. 1700 Kanjur) are reproduced.

The difference between XX 9a 2 and XXII 1a 2 may be due to misprints, but Dr. Laufer's (page 570) statement that merely 31 (not 32) volumes of the Hsi An Kanjur are occupied by the Mdo sna tshogs, can not be explained by assuming a typographical error (Dr. Laufer gives 105 as the total number of volumes in the Hsi An Kanjur). Dr. Laufer bases his table of contents on a Tibetan Dkar chag containing 21 leaves. The Tibetan Dkar chag which I possess has also 21 leaves (not counting the amended copy of leaf No 1, comp. note 15 below), and it enumerates 32 (not 31) Mdo sna tshogs volumes (I-KE), as does the Ōtani catalogue (pages 267-393). The Yung Ho Kung copy of the A.D. 1700 Kanjur has certainly 32 Mdo sna tshogs volumes (I-KE). Shall we assume that two Tibetan Kanjur editions were published in A. D. 1700, one of which had

---

32 Mdo sna tshogs volumes, while the other one had merely 31? I regard the hypothesis, that the distinguished orientalist, who had to work under rather unfavourable conditions when he prepared his table of contents at Hsi An, erred in his calculations, as preferable.

On page 574 of his article Dr. Laufer states that “der von roten Linien eingerahmte rechteckige Schriftsatz” measures 58.9 x 15 cm. This agrees fairly well with my observations: the “rechteckige Schriftsatz” on the leaves (except the first leaves of the volumes) of the Tibetan K'ang Hsi Kanjurs, which I have seen, is of about the same size. The latter varies, however, to a certain extent, and on some leaves, which I have examined, the “rechteckige Schriftsatz” is over 60 cm. long. My own copy of the A. D. 1692 edition as well as the Sung Chu Ssū copy of the A. D. 1692 edition, and the Yung Ho Kung copy of the A. D. 1700 edition are printed with red ink. Another (incomplete) copy of the A. D. 1700 Kanjur, of which I possess a number of leaves, is, however, printed with black ink.

Note 13.
In an A. D. 1724 document (comp. Cordier’s Catalogue du fonds tib., vol. III, page 535) we find the statement that a Kanjur consisting of 106 volumes was published by order of the Emperor K'ang Hsi. This statement evidently refers to the A. D. 1700 edition. Comp. also the 佛教史, vol. III (completed in the 3rd year of Taishō), page 364. All the volumes described in the Ōtani catalogue are marked with Tibetan numerals (the ordinary numerals KA-PHE and the “extra” numerals OM and KṢA), except the 107th volume which contains the Dkar chag. This seems to prove that the Dkar chag (21 leaves) was not regarded as a volume of the


Kanjur. The Imperial «13» Tanjur Dkar chag (204 leaves), a much more voluminous compilation, is marked with a numeral (TSO) and is regarded as one of the 225 volumes of the Imperial Tibetan Tanjur. Comp. Cordier, op. cit., III, 534. The different treatment of the two Dkar chags may be due to the fact that a much higher degree of sanctity is attached to the Kanjur than to the Tanjur, and that a mere table of contents could not be coordinated with the sacred scriptures composing the Kanjur. On page 570 of his article quoted above (note 12) Dr. Laufer mentions a Kanjur Dkar chag, and does evidently not regard it as one of the volumes of the Kanjur.ax

Note 14.
It is a significant fact that in the A. D. 1700 edition the Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud follows immediately after the 'Jig rten mchod bstod sgrub pa rtsa ba'i rgyud, which, according to Csoma-Feer, is the last work of the Rgyud division in the [Narthang] Kanjur. Comp. Ann. du Musee Guimet, vol. II, page 348.ay

Note 15.
There is a Chinese catalogue of the Kanjur which reflects the state of things (as far as the division Rgyud is concerned) which must have existed in A. D. 1692. I mean the 如来大蔵經總目錄, which we find on pages 1040-1053 of the first volume of the 昭和法寶總目録.az This

ax. Already in 1932 in his catalogue, mentioned above in note b, SAKURABE (III:422, note (--) expressed his doubt about the inclusion of the dkar chag in the numbering of the Kanjur proper. Moreover, it is clear that the Peking dkar chag is to be attached to the very first volume of the Rgyud section, with which the Kanjur begins. (I am grateful to Dr Eimer for his clarification of this issue in his letters of 2 Dec., 1998 and 11 March, 1999.)

ay. I have at hand only a copy of CSOMA DE KÖRÖS’s original English “Analysis of the Sher-chin–P’hal-ch’hen–Dkon-séks–Do-dé–Nyáng-dás–and Gyut; being the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th Divisions of the Tibetan Work, entitled the Kah-gyur.” Reprinted in Analysis of the Kanjur. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica 2 (Delhi: Sri Satguru 1982). This of course contains the same indication at the end of the Rgyud as does Leon FEER’s French re-working of CSOMA’s catalogue, Analyse du Kandjour, recueil des livres sacrés au Tibet. Annales du Musée Guimet 2 (Paris: E. Leroux 1881). The ‘Jig rten mchod bstod sgrub pa rtsa ba’i rgyud is the last work in volume zha of the Peking Rgyud.

catalogue does not mention the *Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud* and states that the 22\textsuperscript{nd} [ZA] volume of the Kanjur is occupied by Bu ston's collection of *dhāraṇī* (四部密咒中所集具大攘授咒併心咒疏及一億師傳名號). I possess another (undated xylograph) edition of the 如來大藏經總目錄 which differs somewhat from the edition published in the 昭和法寶總目錄. In my block-print, of which pages 1a and 8a are reproduced on plate VI below, Bu ston's collection of *dhāraṇī* is stated to occupy the superior first (上第一) volume and the *Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud* ([婆] 伽梵聖立鬘 etc.) the 22\textsuperscript{nd} volume (i.e. the 23\textsuperscript{rd} volume if we consider the 上第一 volume as No 1 and the 第一 volume as No 2 etc.).

A complete Tibetan Dkar chag in my possession, which resembles the K'ang Hsi Kanjurs in outward appearance, does not agree with either of the Chinese catalogues just mentioned. It ignores Bu ston's collection of *dhāraṇī* and affirms that the *Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud* occupies volume ZA (22). To the 21 uniform block-printed leaves of this Dkar chag a slightly larger leaf has been added, on which an amended edition of the first page is printed. On plate V below the two versions of the first page are reproduced, and we find that only the later edition of the first page mentions Bu ston's collection of *dhāraṇī* at the top of the list as contained in the "extra" volume OM which takes precedence over volume No 1 (KA). Bu ston's collection of *dhāraṇī* has probably been the object of scholastic discussions between the various «14» editors, because its right to form part of the Kanjur is indeed questionable. The collection, though composed of words ascribed to the Buddha, is admittedly nothing but a kind of anthology compiled by a mere man, who lived about eighteen centuries after the Nirvāṇa.

The Mongolian translation of the Tibetan Kanjur Dkar chag (undated xylograph) which I possess also shows the puzzling peculiarities mentioned above. The first page only is found in it in two editions (one without the volume OM, and the other one with it), and it affirms that the volume ZA contains the *Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud*.

---

和法寶總目錄 is a collection of catalogues and other sources, published as an appendix to the Taishō edition of the Chinese canon.

ba. The reference is found in *Shōwa Hōbō Sōmokuroku* 昭和法寶總目録 I (text 18): 1045c29-1046a1.
Baron Schilling von Canstadt’s Kanjur index with J. J. Schmidt’s preface is unfortunately not available in Peking. Mr. Jacques Bacot, directeur d’études à l’École des Hautes Études, has given us some biographical data about the author of this Kanjur index, who seems to have brought the first considerable collection of Tibetan books to Europe. Comp. Journal Asiatique, Octobre-Decembre 1924, pages 321-348.

Note 16.
The printed emendations which we find in the A. D. 1700 edition have in very many cases been inserted into my copy of the A. D. 1692 edition by the hand of an unknown scribe. The latter has, however, ignored the fact that not only the Tibetan but also the Chinese markings on the pages of Bu ston’s collection had been changed by the A. D. 1700 editors. The unknown scribe’s hand has written OM over the printed ZA (which is,
however, still clearly distinguishable) on page 55a of Bu ston’s collection, but he has left the Chinese number of the volume (二十二) unchanged. Comp. plate III below.

Note 17.

Pages 161b-175b of volume TSI contain a Tibetan version of the Vajracchedikā. On page 169a (line 1) of the A. D. 1700 ed. an empty space between the words bsod nams kyi and phung po (which corresponds to Skt. punyaskandham, page 15, line 3 of Max Müller’s edition) attracts our attention. The A. D. 1692 ed. has bsod nams kyi phung po, and the A. D. 1700 engraver must have simply obliterated the faulty character representing s. In order to close the resulting gap a rearrangement of the correct characters, and consequently the insertion of a piece of wood, would have been necessary. In this as well as in many similar cases the insertion has, however, been dispensed with, and as a result of these omissions unexpected gaps abound in the A. D. 1700 edition. On line 3 of page 174a of vol. TSI the A. D. 1692 edition omits the word tshe, which corresponds to Skt. velāyām (page 25, line 4, of Max Müller’s edition), and the A. D. 1700 edition has it. On line 8 of page 174b of the same volume the A. D. 1692 ed. has tshogs mang ba yin nam, and the A. D. 1700 ed.: tshogs de mang ba yin nam (de, the Tib. equivalent of Skt. sa is required here, comp. page 26, line 15 of Max Müller’s edition). In these cases the A. D. 1700 engraver must have applied the process described above (page 2).

Note 18.

On lines 3-4 of page 99a of volume JU the A. D. 1700 ed. has nga rgyal gyi dbang du gyur pa ma yin te / 'thol zhing bshags pa'i phyir ro (in the A. D. 1692 ed. the important words ma yin are missing).

The words in question occur in one of the Tibetan translations of the Mahāparinirvānasūtra, and the Pei Liang translation of the work (from Sanskrit into Chinese) proves that the A. D. 1700 ed. has the better read-

ing. The Chinese characters 以無懈慢發露悔故, which the Pei Liang version has, have the same meaning as the Tibetan phrase, which we find in the A. D. 1700 edition. Comp. the Taishō Trip. vol. XII, page 400c, lines 7-8.

The following emendation found in the A. D. 1700 ed. is likewise supported by the Pei Liang version: nub par 'gyur bar rig par bya'o (A. D. 1692 ed.: nub par 'gyur bar bya'o, Pei Liang: 當知 ... 將滅, comp. JU 308a 7 and Taishō XII 472a 15-16). The A. D. 1700 reading found on JU 316a 8 (me dang rlung dang sdug bsngal dang) is also preferable to the A. D. 1692 reading: me dang sdug bsngal dang. Comp. Taishō XII 474c 23: 火風苦.

It does not seem probable that the A. D. 1700 emendations are the results of comparative Sino-Tibetan or Indo-Tibetan studies. The texts were probably amended with the help of Tanjur texts only, but I am not in a position to indicate the particular written or printed authorities, on which the A. D. 1700 editors relied.

Note 19.
The Chinese translations of the Saddharmapundarikasūtra by Dharmarakṣa (日月暉) and Kumārajīva (日月燈) also agree with the A. D. 1700 Tibetan version. Comp. the Taishō Trip., vol. IX, page 67a, line 12, and vol IX, page 4c, line 26.

Note 20.
Not all the emendations which we find in the A. D. 1700 text of the Tib. Saddharmapundarikasūtra can be regarded as improvements. The A. D. 1692 line (dge slong dag sangs rgyas kyi spyan gyis ngas), for instance, which corresponds to the words aham bhikṣava buddhacaksūṣā (Skt. text ed. page 145, line 7), is surely to be preferred to the "amended" A. D. 1700 (CHU 63a 7) line: dge slong khyad (not khyed) dag sangs rgyas kyi spyan gyis ngas (ten instead of the nine syllables, which the metre requires).

On page 195b, line 3, the A. D. 1700 editors have changed 'khor las sras (A. D. 1692 ed.) into 'khor los sras. The syllables occur in the be. According to NAKAMURA, “Chibetto-yaku Hōkekyō,” CLD read the line dge slong khyed dag sangs rgyas spyan gyis ngas, which is metrical. I have not been able to check any of the so-called Western Kanjurs, such as the sTog Palace Kanjur, the Tōyō Bunko manuscript or the London manuscript. It would be very interesting to determine their readings of this line.
Tibetan translation of the words rajñaḥ Śubhavyūhasyāntahpurāś catur- 
āṣṭīr antahpurikāsahasrāny asya Saddharmapunḍarikāsya dharmaparyā-
yasya bhājanabhūtāny abhūvan, which Kern (S. B. E. XXI. 424) translates 
as follows:†† Now at that juncture, young men of good family, the eighty-
four thousand women of the harem of the king Śubhavyūha became 
worthy of being receptacles of this Dharmaparyāya of the Lotus of the 
True Law. The correct Tibetan translation of the words antahpurāś 
caturāṣṭīr antahpurikāsahasrāny would be: btsun mo'i 'khor las slas 
 brag yad khri bzhi stong. The A. D. 1700 editors have retained the faulty 
sras (meaning: son) of the A. D. 1692 edition and further debased the 
corrupt translation by changing las into los (probably under the influence 
of the well-known expression 'khor los sgyur ba'i rgyal po'i btsun mo, 
comp. my ed. of the Kāśyapaparivarta, page 122, line 1). According to 
Jaeschke (dict., page 586) slas = wives and servants. Some of the emenda-
tions, which we find in the A. D. 1700 ed., are only partly correct. On 
page CHU 201a 5-6, for instance, the A. D. 1700 ed. has: sarvasatvaru-
atala kośalyakauśalyānugate (A. D. 1692: sarvasatvaratala kośalyanagate, 
the Skt. text of the Lotus sūtra, page 477: sarvasattvarakauśalyānu-
gate).†† The A. D. 1700 editor has evidently forgotten to obliterate the 
faulty syllables kośalya.†† Kumārajīva transliterates the dḥāraṇī, in which 
the expression (薩婆薩埵樓敬懸合略阿彌伽地) occurs, but Dharmarākṣa 
gives (a very imperfect) translation of it (瞭眾生音). Comp. the Taishō 
Trip., vol. IX, page 61b, line 26-27, and vol. IX, page 133b, line 9. This 
is not the only dḥāraṇī which exists in a Chinese translation as well as in 
a Chinese transliteration. Comp. my notes 3 and 10 on pages 181 and 183 
of the Supplementary volume I of the Bulletin of the Institute of History 
and Philology of the Academia Sinica (Peiping 1932).††

†† Hendrik Kern, The Saddharma-pundarīka, or The Lotus of the True Law. 
found on page 463.10-11. Nakamura’s text reads: bṛṣṇa mo'i 'khor los [CDLN: 

†† This is a dḥāraṇī, and thus transcribed in Tibetan. The Sanskrit here is found at 
477.3.

†† Compare the observation on this false reading already in Eugène Burnouf: Le 
Lotus de la Bonne Loi (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale 1852; Reprint: Adrien 

†† “On a Peking, a St. Petersburg, and a Kyōto reconstruction of a Sanskrit stanza 
transcribed with Chinese characters under the Northern Sung Dynasty,” in the 
Ts''ai Yuân-p'ei Anniversary Volume (Supplementary volume 1 of the Bulletin 
On page 186 of the Skt. text of the Lotus sūtra we find the adjective *adhimuktisārām* (CHU 82b 1: mos pa snying por byed pa), which is followed by the adjective *sūnyadharmagatiṅgatām* (stong pa'i chos rtags par khong du chud pa). The A. D. 1700 ed. inserts the syllables stong pa'i chos rtags par byed pa, which are missing in the A. D. 1692 ed. and have no equivalent in the Skt. version, between the two expressions. Neither in Dharmarakṣa’s nor in Kumārajīva’s translation do we find anything corresponding to the additional adjective. Comp. the Taishō Trip., vol. IX, page 92b, line 19, and vol. IX, page 25c, line 21.

Note 21.

On page 171 of my edition of the *Kāśyapaparīvarta* we find four Tibetan lines which are not represented in the Indian and Chinese versions of the work. These lines are missing in the A. D. 1692 Kanjur, but the A. D. 1700 edition as well as the Narthang (Snar thang) edition have them. In at least two cases the readings of the «17» A. D. 1700 Tibetan version of the *Kāśyapaparīvarta* are certainly wrong. 'I 123a 2: sems can yongs su tshol ba'i brtson 'grus so, Skt., page 142, lines 21-22: cittaparigavesatāye vīryam, A. D. 1692: sems yongs su etc. 'I 123a 8: 'jig cing 'jug pa'o, Skt., page 144, line 10: bhagnavilīna, A.D. 1692: 'jig cing 'ju ba'o. In both cases the Skt. text proves the A. D. 1692 readings to be correct.


bj. The Sanskrit is found on 186.10. No additional term is found either in the Kashgar (Hirofumi TŌDA: *Saddharmapudārīkasūtra: Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text* [Tokushima: Kyōiku Shuppan Center 1981]) or Gilgit (Shoko WATANABE: *Saddharmapudārika Manuscripts Found in Gilgit. Part Two: Romanized Text* [Tokyo: The Ōeiyukan 1975]) texts. The Tibetan text of Peking printed by NAKAMURA, however, while very cramped, indicating there was some correction made on the blocks to accommodate the extra text, cites no variants from CDLN. The so-called Western Kanjurs, sTog, London, Tōyō Bunko, should definitely be checked.

bk. Both are confirmed by the sTog Palace Kanjur, dkon brtsegs, cha: §97, sTog 230b4; §98, sTog 231a3.
Note 22.
Mademoiselle Lalou (Journal Asiatique, Octobre-Décembre 1927, pages 256 and 238) has already pointed out that the Bhadrapālaśreṣṭhiparipṛcchā is missing in the Berlin manuscript Kanjur and that there is a mistake connected with it in the "table des matières du Kanjur de Pekin," which is probably a copy of the block-printed Tibetan Dkar chag mentioned above (pages 12 and 13). In this Dkar chag (page 14a, line 5) the Bhadrapālaśreṣṭhiparipṛcchā appears as the lag bzangs kyi[s] zhus pa (I omit the Tibetan equivalents of ārya, of nāma, and of mahāyānasūtra). This title is a translation of Skt. Subahuparipṛcchā. In the Chinese block-printed Dkar chag or catalogue mentioned above (page 15) and in the Chinese Dkar chag published in the 昭和法寶總目錄 we also find the equivalent of Subāhu (妙手) where we would expect to find the equivalent of Bhadrapāla. The Bhadrapālaśreṣṭhiparipṛcchā is referred to in these Chinese Dkar chags with the characters 妙手長者請問 (I omit the Chinese equivalent of mahāyānasūtra, comp. the 昭和 etc., vol. I, page 1049c, line 7). The con- fusion of the names Subāhu and Bhadrapāla (Śreṣṭhin = tshong dpon = 長者 is an unimportant part of the title) would not surprise us, if the Chinese version of the Dkar chag of the Tibetan Kanjur could not be regarded as the original version, because 妙守 (Miao Shou, a possible equivalent of Bhadrapāla) might very easily be mixed up with its homophone 妙手 (Miao Shou, which actually renders Subāhu in the Mahāvyutpatti, Sakaki edition, No. 3242) by a Chinese scribe. But the Chinese version cannot be the original, because there are too many obvious Tibetanisms in it.

The Skt. word śatasāhasrika (Ōtani cat., page 230, line 3) appears as 千百 (= 1.100, instead of 百千 = 100.000) in the Chinese Dkar chag (comp. the 昭和 etc., vol. I, page 1049a, line 25). This is evidently due to a misinterpretation of the words stong phrag brgya (= 100.000), which we find in the Tibetan Dkar chag (page 13a, line 6). The Skt. name Sumati (Ōtani cat., page 248, line 15) appears as 意賢 (mati + su) in the Chinese Dkar chag (comp. the 昭和 etc., vol. I, page 1049b, line 26). This is evidently due to a misinterpretation of the words blo gros bzang mos, which we find in the Tib. Dkar chag (page 14a, line 1). The Skt. name Susūhitamati (Ōtani cat., page 250, line 18) appears as 意慧妙住 (mati + sūstita) in the Chinese Dkar chag (comp. the 昭和 etc., vol. I, page 1049c, line 3). This is evidently due to a misinterpretation of the

words blo gros rab gnas kyis, which we find in the Tib. Dkar chag (page 14a, line 3). In a similar way the curious name 妙施無垢 <18> [Dattavimala, instead of Vimaladattā], which we find in the Chinese Dkar chag (comp. the 昭和 etc., vol. I, page 1049b, line 29) can be explained. The Skt. name Gaṅgottara (Ōtani cat., page 248, line 25) appears as 滿勝 in the Chinese Dkar chag (comp. the 昭和 etc., vol. I, page 1049b, line 27). This is evidently due to a misinterpretation of the words gang ga’i mchog, which we find in the Tib. Dkar chag (page 14a, line 2). The Tibeto-Chinese translator has not recognized the name of the Indian river (Gaṅ ga, sic) and faithfully translated the syllable gaṅ (which is Indian, not Tibetan) into Chinese (滿 too means “full”) as if it had been Tibetan. On the other hand, the Tibeto-Chinese translator of the Dkar chag transliterated the Tibetan syllable gang (po) in a title where it should have been rendered by 滿 (or 圓滿 etc.) or by a transliteration of the Skt. name Pūrṇa. To the Skt. title Pūrṇapramukha-avadānasataka (Ōtani cat., page 390, line 9) the words gang po la sogs pa’i rtogs pa brjod pa brgya pa (Tib. Dkar chag, page 20a, lines 7-8) and 説網波等百悟經 (comp. the 昭和 etc., vol. I, page 1052c, line 19) correspond in our Dkar chags.

Note 23.
The A. D. 1692 volumes ZA (285 leaves, A. D. 1700: 332 l.), ZHI (331 l., A. D. 1700: 350 l.), and ‘I (288 l., A. D. 1700: 311 l.) are the only ones which differ from the A. D. 1700 volumes (bearing the same Tibetan ordinals) in the number of their leaves. The difference between the A. D. 1692 volume ZA and the A. D. 1700 volume ZA is, of course, due to the fact that Bu ston’s collection of dhāraṇīs, which filled volume ZA in the A. D. 1692 edition, was transferred to the newly added volume OM in A. D. 1700, and that the Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud occupied the volume vacated by Bu ston’s compilation. Comp. above pages 2 and 13.

Note 24.
Page ‘I 50b of the A. D. 1700 edition seems to have been printed with a newly prepared block (not with an A. D. 1692 block corrected by the A. D. 1700 editors). Nearly all the other blocks of the A. D. 1692 edition have evidently been used by the A. D. 1700 editors (who amended a considerable part of them and added the blocks for the Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud, the Vidyutprāptaparipṛcchā and the Bhadrapālaparipṛcchā to their number) for the A. D. 1700 Kanjur. Comp. above pages 2 and 13. Owing to the insertion of the Bhadrapālaparipṛcchā into the
middle of volume 'I the great majority of its leaves had to be renumbered, and the Kāṣyapaparivāra, for instance, is found on pages 100b - 138a in the A. D. 1700 edition (in the A. D. 1692 edition: on pages 77b - 115a).

The insertion of the Vidyutprāptaparipṛcchā caused less trouble, because the «19» proper place of that work is after the Ugraparipṛcchā, which is the last sūtra in the A. D. 1692 edition of volume ZHI.

Note 25.
A number of irregularities, which Beckh has discovered in the Berlin manuscript Kanjur, are found equally in the A. D. 1692 edition. Both collections have vepulīya (instead of vaipulya) in the Skt. title of the first volume of the Buddhāvatamsaka. Comp. page 14 of Beckh’s Verzeichnis and the first page of volume YI of the A. D. 1692 edition. Both collections designate theVyāsaparipṛcchā as the 48th le’u of the Ratnakūta, and both add a note to the effect that it is the 49th le’u. Comp. Beckh’s Verzeichnis, page 25. On page 288a of volume ‘I of the A. D. 1692 edition we read the following words: ‘Phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i chos kyi’s [sic] rnam grangs le’u stong phrag brgya pa las / drang srong rgyas pa’i zhus pa'i le’u zhes bya ste bzhi bcu rtsa brgyad pa rdzogs sho / le’u bzhi bcu dgu pa. The Vyāsaparipṛcchā is the 47th le’u of the Ratnakūta (neither the 48th nor the 49th le’u) in the Berlin manuscript Kanjur as well as in the A. D. 1692 edition, both of which omit two le’u out of the regular 49 le’u. Comp. above pages 3 and 18.

Note 26.
Beckh (Verzeichnis, page VI) regards the Berlin manuscript Kanjur as a copy of the Derge xylograph, and Pelliot (Journal Asiatique, Juillet-Août 1914, page 115) says: Si on se rappelle en outre que cet exemplaire de Berlin a été acquis à Pékin, il apparaîtra comme vraisemblable, malgré sa division en 108 volumes qui est celle de l’édition du Derge, qu’il dérive en réalité, non pas de l’édition du Derge, mais d’une recension apparentée aux recensions pékinoises et que je suis malheureusement hors d’état de déterminer. bm

The red Paris Kanjur quoted by Mlle Lalou in the Journal Asiatique contains the two parts of the Ratnakūta, which are missing in the A. D. 1692 edition.

bm. It may just be noted here that of course Pelliot is correct; the real origins of the Berlin manuscript Kanjur were pointed out also in 1914 by Berthold Laufer in his review of Beckh’s Verzeichnis (see note k, above), in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1914: 1128-1130.
1692 edition (comp. above page 3), and Pelliot (op. cit., page 114) is evidently right in regarding the red Paris Kanjur as an incomplete? copy of the same (A. D. 1700) edition, which Laufer saw at Hsi An.

I am not in a position to examine the "Imperial" Kanjur, which the Asiatic Museum of St. Petersburg possesses, but I took a manuscript of the Tibetan translation of the Kāśyapaparīvarta with me to Peking in 1917. This manuscript was copied from the "Imperial" Kanjur of St. Petersburg, and I have compared it with the version, which the Yung Ho Kung copy of the A. D. 1700 edition contains. The two texts are in complete agreement, and I believe that the "Imperial" Kanjur of St. Petersburg too is a copy of the A. D. 1700 edition. Comp. page XX of my edition of the Kāśyapaparīvarta. «20»

At the last moment I learnt from Mr. T. L. Yuan, the director of the Peking National Library, that a considerable number of Tibetan Kanjur volumes were still stored in the Forbidden City of Peking, and I examined some of them. All the volumes I saw there showed the characteristics of the A. D. 1692 edition, except the volume containing Bu ston's collection of dhāranīs, which had evidently been printed with the A. D. 1692 blocks as corrected by the A. D. 1700 editors (comp. above page 3). In addition to these volumes I have years ago seen three evidently complete copies of the Tibetan Kanjur in the Forbidden City, but they were all hand-written. The beautifully written manuscripts (golden letters on blue paper) have shared the fate of most of the Peking Palace treasures, and repose at present in the vaults of a Shanghai bank. bn

Peking, January 14th 1934.

bn. It is possible that this is a reference to the so-called Taipei manuscript Kanjur (I do not know if there is more than one in the National Palace Museum, and apparently large parts of the collection still remain uncatalogued). As far as I know, the only listing for this Kanjur is that in Select Chinese Rare Books and Historical Documents in the National Palace Museum (Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1971): #24 (Lung-tsang-ching 龍藏經). A description is found on page 70 (Chinese), p. 89 (Japanese), p. 108 (English). The descriptions in the three languages differ slightly. Illustrated with one plate.

According to a letter from Dr. Eimer (2 Dec., 1998), a catalogue of this Kanjur is in preparation, and he himself plans to publish some remarks on it soon.
Plate Ia: The end of a Tibetan ode in praise of the Kanjur.

Plate Ib: The end of a Chinese version of the ode in praise of the Kanjur.
Plate IIa: This proves that an edition of the Kanjur was completed at Peking in A. D. 1692.

Plate IIb: The page reproduced here contains a Mongolian translation of the Tibetan lines found on IIa. The Mongolian translation ignores the Chinese line.
Plate IIIa: Page 55a of Bu ston’s collection of dhāraṇīs as it appears in the A.D. 1692 edition.

Plate IIIb: Page 55a of Bu ston’s collection of dhāraṇīs as it appears in the A.D. 1700 edition.
Plate IVa: The first page of the *Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud* (A. D. 1700 Kanjur).

Plate IVb: The last page of the *Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud* (A. D. 1700 Kanjur).
Plate VIIa: A page of the Tibetan translation of the *Saddharmapundarikasūtra* as it appears in the A. D. 1692 edition. [Plate VIIb: Missing.]

Plate VIIIa: Page 50b of volume I as it appears in the A. D. 1692 edition. [Plate VIIIb: Missing.]