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Introduction to Alexander von Staël-Holstein’s Article “On a Peking Edition of the Tibetan Kanjur Which Seems to be Unknown in the West”

Edited for publication by
JONATHAN A. SILK

Baron Alexander Wilhelm von Staël-Holstein is probably unlikely to be mentioned immediately in a contemporary conversation about great Buddhist scholars. Yet he was, without a doubt, a splendid researcher. Through a life filled with turmoil, he accomplished a very great deal, mostly in the field of Buddhist Studies, and again, largely in the realm of philological work. Among other studies, he edited texts (including the famous Kāśyapa-parivarta), reconstructed lost Sanskrit materials from Chinese and Tibetan, and investigated Sino-Tibetan Buddhist art. He was also one of the first to devote serious attention to the problems raised by the textual history of Tibetan canonical collections. The article presented here has been known to a small circle of scholars for some years, but the number of copies in circulation was very small. In fact, I know of only two originals, one held in the Harvard-Yenching Library, the other in the “Sylvain Lévi collection” (the second according to the kind information of Prof. D. S. Ruegg). The article was printed, but never published, as “On a Peking edition of the Tibetan Kanjur which seems to be unknown in the West.” It was apparently to appear in the Harvard Sino-Indian Series, vol. 3. On the back cover of what we might term the “pre-print” is found “Peking – Lazarist Press,” and on the front “Peking 1934.” As I have observed before, the copy in

Harvard is inscribed on the title page by Staël-Holstein himself to Dean G. H. Chase. The note says: "If the editors [?] almost illegible] approve of my suggest[ion] these pages will be published as the fi[rst] twenty pages of vol IV of the Harvard Sino-Ind[ian Series]. Compare my letter [of] February 27th [date obscured]." Given this, it cannot be considered absolutely certain whether publication was intended in volume III or IV of the Harvard Sino-Indian Series, although volume III is the more likely. In any case, that the article has lost little of its value in the sixty-five (!) years since it was written is a testimony to the excellence of Staël-Holstein’s scholarship, and also perhaps to the failure of later scholars to follow his lead into certain areas of comparative Sino-Tibetan studies. It is certainly high time that this excellent example of his fruitful research be presented to an audience wider than those few scholars who were able to obtain photocopies of the rare extant prints of the original publication. I am therefore grateful to the editors of the Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, and to the authorities of the Harvard-Yenching Library, who have generously given their permission for this publication.

In preparing the following article for publication, I have done little, and have changed the basic text not at all; I have added a few additional references, and clarified some of Staël-Holstein’s own abbreviated references. While these may have been clear to an audience of peers sixty years ago, today many are likely to be obscure to most readers. Other than this, I have made only the following cosmetic changes: I have italicized quoted Tibetan and Sanskrit; in the original, everything was printed in Roman type, with the exception of several italicizations for emphasis. I have indented the long quotation from the colophon, which was not indented in the original. And I have modified the transliteration schemes of both Sanskrit and Tibetan, bringing the latter into line with the so-called Wylie system; Staël-Holstein’s original used older systems, which I supposed might be unfamiliar to contemporary readers. The original page numbers are inserted in bold capital letters, thus «I», in order to facilitate reference to the original, which is sometimes cited. All adjustments, modifications and corrections I offer are added only in notes.

The footnotes are entirely mine, and are marked with lower case roman letters, while the end-notes are those of Staël-Holstein’s original article, marked by arabic numerals, followed by a right parenthesis. In my footnotes, in addition to providing complete references, in a few instances I have sought to clarify issues left unclear by Staël-Holstein. In only a very few cases I have corrected what I believe to be errors made by Staël-Holstein.

Staël-Holstein’s original article was accompanied by eight pages of plates containing sixteen folio leaves in Tibetan, Chinese and Mongolian. I regret that, in the end, it has not been possible to reproduce all of these plates of the original article. The quality of the plates in the xerox copy I have is not high, and despite the fine help of Ms. Ruohong Li at Harvard, I have not been able to locate the originals of plates V, VI, VIIb and VIIIb, which include leaves from the 1700 Kanjur stated by Staël-Holstein to belong to the National Library of Peking. I trust this will not prove a hardship to very many readers. In this regard, I must also mention the excellent and generous assistance given me by my wife, Yoko, in preparing the new plates on the computer, for which I am most grateful. Some corrections and suggestions were kindly offered by Dr. Helmut Eimer, and Gene Smith, for which I am very appreciative. I am of course responsible for the remaining errors of mine (although not for any of those of Staël-Holstein which, despite my best efforts, may rest uncorrected).


4. Staël-Holstein’s original captions for the plates I have been unable to reproduce read as follows:

Plate V: The original (above) and the amended (below) version of the first page of a Tibetan Dkar chag (table of contents).
Plate VI: Pages 1A and 8A of a Chinese Dkar chag (table of contents) of the A. D. 1700 edition of the Tibetan Kanjur.
Plate VII: A page of the Tibetan translation of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkāsūtra as it appears ... in the A. D. 1700 edition (below). Note the emendations on lines 1 and 5 of the A. D. 1700 page.
Plate VIII: Page 50b of volume I as it appears ... in the A. D. 1700 edition (below).
It should be noted here that the edition discussed by Staël-Holstein is now to be found in the Rare Book room of the Harvard-Yenching Library, where it is catalogued as Tib 1803.7 / 14. It has an accession stamp of June 28, 1939, and was acquired from the Sino-Indian Institute in Peking. The text is printed in red on folios approximately 69 × 24 cm, with a printed area of about 60 × 14 cm. Volumes 29, 45, 53, 59 and 61 are missing from the set. It is remarkable that the very volume 61, or hi in the Tibetan system (a part of the Phal po che), which belongs to this set is currently to be found in the Kalamazoo Valley Museum in Kalamazoo, Michigan. How this volume got separated from the volumes acquired by Staël-Holstein is not known exactly, but it was purchased for $50 by Mr. Albert M. Todd already in 1926 from Edward Barrett, a New York fur dealer who apparently had something of a sideline in peddling Chinese “curiosities.” Barrett stated in his description which accompanied the volume: “This book was procured by Edward Barrett from the Imperial Library in Peking, China, 1924.” One certainly gains the impression that the “procurement” was not an entirely kosher transaction, but given the turmoil in China in those days, it is unlikely we will ever learn what actually happened. (It is interesting, however, that Barrett knew when [he dated it to 1693], where and by whom the volume had been printed.) The volume was presented to the Kalamazoo Public Library in November 1932 by the heirs of Mr. Todd, under the terms of his will, and microfilmed already in 1942 by Horace Poleman of the Library of Congress. But it apparently remained otherwise unknown until it was identified in 1986 by my friend Bruce Cameron Hall. Dr. Hall, who had worked to catalogue the Harvard collection, is remarkably enough perhaps the one person in the world who could have recognized on sight this volume as coming from the same set as the Harvard-Yenching Kanjur. While a post-doctoral fellow at the University of Michigan, he investigated local Tibetan holdings and discovered the Kalamazoo volume. It is a further coincidence that I held, during the period when I was preparing the present article, a post at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, which enabled me to easily examine this volume.

Jonathan A. Silk


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

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. The Prussian State Library possesses thirty six volumes belonging to the A. D. 1410 edition, but no complete copy of it is definitely known to have survived anywhere.

a. 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., Suhhekha: Festgabe für Helmut Eimer, Indica et Tibetica 28 (Swisttal-Endendorf, 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・永楽版と徳済・り坦版について [The Sera Yung-lo and the Drepung Lithang], Nihon Chibetto Gakkai Kaihô 日本西藏学会会報 41-42 (1997): 23-32. In addition, I regret 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 Daizokuyo Shohon no Keifu (1): Eirakuban Kanyuru ni kanshite” 西藏大経諸版の系譜 (1): 永楽版カンギユルに関して [Lineages of Various Printings of the Tibetan Canon 1: The Yung-lo Kanjur], Bukkyô Daigaku Daigakuin Kiyô 佛教大學大學院紀要 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 辛崎静思: 163, n. 33, and 175, l. 8 from the bottom 逃→逃; 175, last line, and 176 first line: 微→微; 186, l. 4 from bottom:彫→彫; 175, l. 3, punctuate … 化導群類。非上 …; line 6, punctuate 戴。此…: 186, l. 7, punctuate … 厭事。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 御製藏經論略 kindly sent me by Prof. Ochi; 186, l. 3: delete 四; 1. 7: 干→于; 1. 16: 諾→譏. 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 > Hakuyû; 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 Otani 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.

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 Butter Kenkyūkai チベット仏典研究会 (Tibetan Buddhist Text Society) of Sendai, is devoted to studies of the Lankāvatārā-sūtra. (With respect to p. 163, n. 33, Karashima also informed me of the Chinese term 梵志, which means "to engrave.")

b. SAKURABE Bunkyō 梶部文雄, A Comparative Analytical Catalogue of the Kanjur Division of the Tibetan Tripitaka / Otani Daigaku Toshokan Zō: Chibetto Daizōkyō Kanjūrū Kandō Mokuroku, 大谷大学図書館蔵・西藏大藏經甘珠爾同目録. 3 volumes (Kyoto: Otani 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 bhūjībhun
sngon spyad bsod nas las 'khrungs chu gter las /
/nmad byung thugs rje'i bralbs 'phreng cher g-yos te /
/nam yang zad med smon lam si tā'i * klong /
/snyigs dus sky 'gro'i bsod nams zhing mchog tu /
/babs pa'i bskal bzang gser gyi snye ma'i 'bras /
/legs par smin pa'i mdo sde'i bka' 'gyur 'di /
/dpal pa'i 'phags pa'i lha khang 'khrungs kau si 'i /
/dge srong bshin pa rgya mtsho gtsos mdzad ba'i /
/dpon slob tshogs kyi lhag bsam dag pa'i mthabs /
/gnas bsksos gser mngag khang hi gser gyi * khriv /
/ri rab lhun po'i lta bu brtan gyur ciq [v] /
/dge 'di dbar soogs rgyu bsho bshin bdag dang /
/pho ma gtsos byas 'gro drug sams can mams /
/gnas ngan len gyi 'ching ba' las grol te /
/sangs rgyas zhing du myur du skye bar shog /
/thub bstan spiyi dang 'jam mgon tsong kha pa'i /
/chos srid zung la dbang bsgyur mes po yi /
/sku tsho mnga' 'thang srid mthar * rgyas pa dang /
/bkra shing bde dpal la spyod par shog /
/dza yantu / ta'i ching khar [read: khang] hi lo sum cu so geig chu pho sprol lo snrlul gyi zla ba'i chu pho khryi rgyal gyi ni yia ma la dgu btsug * nas mon gru zla ba'i sa pho stag dga' ba niy ma'i bar du legs par bsgrubs pa'o /

This [is the] Kanjur [composed of] sūtras – rice-grains of an auspicious golden ear, which have developed because un-interrupted 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 Pūnyākṣerā of the Kāliyuga.

May the purity of the intentions [adhyātaya-suddhi] 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 Ssu,[b] serve to keep the gold-born 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 khryi rgyal (male water «2» dog victory) day of the snul month of the chu pho spro (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[a] 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 Ssu (崇祝寺) 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), KA-A (1 volume), KSA (30 volumes), KU-U (30 volumes), and KE-PHE (14 volumes), altogether 105 volumes. [11] In the A.D. 1700 edition too we find volumes marked KA-A, KSA, KI-I, KU-U, and KE-PHE, but the A. D. 1700 editors considered the inclusion of the Rała 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 Rała pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud with the character ZA.[14] The work (Bu ston’s collection of dharmaṃs), 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 (上第一) volume of the Rgyud division of the Kanjur. On 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 祕密經第二十二巻上五十五, while the A. D. 1700 edition of the page bears the following marks: Rgyud OM nga lnga gong and 祕密經上第壹巻上五十五. 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. 1692 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 Saddharmapūndarikasūtra (ed. by Kern and Nanjio, Bibl. Buddhica X, page 25, line 1)

has candrārkadīpa 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.


A number of emendations, which we find on pages 100b-138a of vol. ‘I of the A. D. 1700 Kanjur (Tibetan translation of the Kāśyapaavaparivarta), are equally supported by the corresponding Skt. text (comp. my edition of it which appeared at Shanghai in 1926). ‘I 103b 5: med (Skt., page 18, line 4: niṣṭḥyuthāno), A. D. 1692: byed. ‘I 122a 5: sdug par (Skt., page 137, line 16: śubha), A. D. 1692: sdug bsgnal. ‘I 125a 4: dge sbyong (Skt., page 154, line 7: śrāmano), A. D. 1692: dge slong. ‘I 132a 7: mos pa mi mnga’ ba dag gis (Skt. page 201, line 25: anadhimuktibhule, A. D. 1692: mos pa mi mnga’ ba dag gis). ‘I 133b 5: snyoms par jug pa (Skt., page 209, line 21: 8 samāpatti, A. D. 1692: sens par jug pa).

The A. D. 1700 editors have not confined their efforts to correcting mistakes like these in their version of volume ‘I, but have added an entire sūtra, the Bhadrapālaśreṣṭhiparipraccchā (A. D. 1700 ed., vol. ‘I, 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 Vidyuṭprātaparipraccchā (A. D. 1700 ed., vol. ZHI, pages 333b-350a). Both sūtras belong to the Mahāratnakūṭadharmaparvā, a collection containing 49 (in the A. D. 1692 ed.: 47) works. The inclusion of the Vidyuṭprātaparipraccchā and

---


e. According to the Tibetan texts edited by NAKAMURA Zuiryū 中村瑞隆 et al., “Chietto-yaku Hokekyo” チベット語法華経, Hokke Bunka Kenkyu 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 Nathang [denoted by NAKAMURA C, D, L, N] read zhaba ’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, Nathang 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.).

---
of the Bhadrapālaśreṣṭhipariprcchā, 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 Sarva-buddhamahārāhasyasapyāyakausalyajñānottarabodhisattvapariprcchāparā varta and the beginning of the Dārikavimalaśaddhāpariprcchā occupied in the A. D. 1692 edition. 24)«4»

The Berlin manuscript and the A. D. 1692 xylograph are the only Kanjurs known to me which omit the Vidyuprāptapariprcchā as well as the Bhadrapālaśreṣṭhipariprcchā. The A. D. 1692 edition has many other features in common with the volumes described by Beckh, 25) k the similarity of the two collections may some day help to solve the mystery, which still surrounds the Berlin manuscript Kanjur. 26)«5»

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 (補) edition of the Tibetan Kanjur. 1 Comp. the document dated K’ang Hsi 39 [=A.D. 1700] which is reprinted on pages 10-11 of the Ōtani cat.

(dkon brtseg 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 北村海, Director of the Töyō Bunko, for kindly sending me a photocopy of Tada’s handwritten list.

j. "hasyapa" should be written "hasya-upāya"; it does not indicate the diphong.


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 [Bhiṣkū] 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 (jarly iyar nüküüjy seyil kemeksen ganjür nom i külüen üjejü üyiledgegilüусen ʃasay un elbeg çin wang tüssim füčuwan ... engke anmyulang un yučin vüsgüüer on ujun u terigüi sara yin sayin ed wür seyilejü tegüsgebör). 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 seyl 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 JÄSCHKE, A Tibetan-English Dictionary (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1881). The complications raised by compounds with the term bzhengs have been discussed by HADANO Hakuyū 羽田恒伯, “Chibetto daizōkyō engi: ‘Sono ichi’ – Naran daigakumonji no senkuteki jigyō o megure”, チベット大藏経緯, [その一] ナルタン大学間の先駆的事业をめぐって, [A history of the compiling and editing of the Tibetan Buddhist Scriptures, “Bkah-lgur and Bstan-lgur”]: part 1: the pioneering work of Narthang monas-
Note 2.
Comp. Grüneweol’s *Mythologie*, page 74. 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 9th day of the 3rd month of the 8th 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. The Tibetan version of the ode omits the Wan Li note. Comp. plate I below.

On page 41 of his 西藏佛學原論 (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. I am indebted to Mr. Yü (於道泉) for having drawn my attention to Mr. Lü’s book.

---

t. The Chinese reads 大清康熙参拾壹年仲夏朔日京都崇国寺格龙印纲监佑发心印造.


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 Punyākṣetra (bsod nams zhiṅ) 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 (‘bras) 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 Punyākṣetra.

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 (八大大河, chu klung chen po brygyad) are: (1) 恒河, in the Tib. text: gang gā. (2) 鬱摩羅, yam pa la. (3) 薩羅, sal (or sa la’i). (4) 阿梨羅跋提, a la la bar ta. (5) 摩訶, mahā. (6) 辛頭, 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). The Chinese translation was made under the Pei Liang dynasty (397-439), comp. Nanjian 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 Hīṅgula) only in the corresponding passage. Comp. the A.D. 1692 Kanjur, vol. TU, page 42a, line 8.

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

From the 勝鬘窟（意 wādūra, 瑪瑙） fixed to the western part of the Anavatapta lake. Comp. the Taishō Trip. vol. 37, page 43b, line 2. Comp. also page 377c (line 25) of volume 35 of the Taishō Trip.

Mr. Pankratoff tells me that the Mongolian translation of our document (reproduced only 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 bska’ <8b> bzang by saying Zubitu (meaning: auspi-


ac. The Shēng-man pao-k’u’ 勝鬘窟 is a 6th-7th century commentary on the Śrīmālādevī-sūtra by the great San-lun scholar Chi-tiang 吉藏, in which we find T. 1744 (XXXVII) 43b2-3 the following: 西有琉璃馬頭口中流出悉陀河．

ad. The Hua-yen ching t’an-hsüan chi 華嚴經撰玄記 is a work of the famous seventh century monk Fa-tsang 法藏. According to Ono Gemmyo’s 小野玄妙Bussho Kaisetsu Daijiten 佛教解說大辭典 (Tokyo: Daiō shuppansha 大東出版社, 1932-35: 3.26d), it dates to 687-695. There we read T. 1733 (XXXV) 277c25: 西面璃璃口出悉陀河.
cious), which, according to the dictionaries, is an equivalent of skal bzang (subhaga), not of bskal bzang (bhadra kalpa). 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 Kālidāsa's 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 (格龙) Sbyin pa rgya mtsho (印吧监佐) of the temple called Ch'ung Kuo Ssu (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 Panchen 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). 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.

ae. The article is found on pp. 300-302 of the journal. My thanks are due J.-L. Taffarel, Librarian of the École Française d’ Extrême-Orient, for kindly sending me a copy. The phrase to which Staël-Holstein refers is: shākyā’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 author of the postface must be the famed Bka’ gyur Bla ma Sbyin pa rgya mtsho (1629-1695), the 46th Khri of Dga’ ldan (1692-1695). [See Rudolf KASCHEWSKY: “Die Abte von Dga’-ldan,” Zentralasiatische Studien 4 (1970): 263: the 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 ma 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 张怡源 [Peking: Min-tsu ch’u-pan-shè 民族出版社 1985]: 3271: 1692: Chos rje bka’ ‘gyur ba sbyin pa rgya mtsho dga’ ldan khri phibs, and 1693: Gong ma khang shis lcang skya ngag dbang chos ldan po cin du gdan drangs.]


ai. The correct date is 1235.

aj. In the standard edition of 1923 the reference is on page 7a of chiian 6 (史部, 地理類).
Note 7.
According to the Mahāvyutpati (Sakaki ed., No 8424 and No 8473) gnas ngan len = duśhūla. 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 mhog tu dge ba'i zhi md gi rgyal dbang sa steng gi rgyal bstan yongs kyi dbag po thams cad mkhyen pa bdra' dha ra tā la'i bla ma'i tham ga. 西天大善自在佛所領天下釋教普通瓦赤拉咀喇達額喇嘛之印

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 mchod tu dge ba'i zhi md gi rgyal dbang sa steng gi rgyal bstan yongs kyi dbag po thams cad mkhyen pa bdra' dha ra tā [sic] la'i bla mar 'bod pa'i gtsam) 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 Chêng 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] 赤拉坦喇達額喇嘛之印. Only the Chinese text of the inscription is given in the Wei Tsang T'ung Chih. 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. māla, and mīla (mālan) <10> is, according to the Vyutpattī (Sakaki ed., No 3203), a name of the 17th nakṣatra. The Tibetan name of the nakṣatra called mīla in Skt. is snrula (not snrul), comp. the Vyutp. l. c., S. C. Das, dict., page 772, and the Skt.-Tib. dict. ed. by Bacot, page 99b. am 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 gru of the Tibetan version. According to the Vyutp. (Sakaki ed., No 3208 and No 3209), satabhisā (Tib. mon gre or mon dre) is the 22nd nakṣatra, and dhanīstha (Tib. mon gru) the 23rd nakṣatra. According to S. C. Das, however, mon gru = satabhisā, and mon dre = dhanīṣṭhā. The Skt.-Tib. dict. published by Bacot (page 131b) and the 雙體合璧文鑑 (chapter I, page 5b) an agree with the Vyutp. as to the Skt. equivalents of mon gru (dhanīṣṭhā, danista) and mon gre (satabhisā, satabis). ap 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-shu 文海出版社 1965), in the series Chung-kuo pien-chiang ts'ung-shu: ti 1 chi 中國邊疆叢書第一輯. The cited passage is found in chiač 15, 15b (my punctuation): 齊正二年。頒頒額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額喇嘛之印。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-wén-chien edited in Gotai Shimbun Kan Yakki 五體清文鑒譯解 (Tamura Jitsuzō 田村實造, Imamushi Shunju 今西春秋, and Satō Hisashi 佐藤長, eds., Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Bungakubu Nairiku Ajia Kenkyūjo 京都大学文学部内地アジア研究所 1966), mon gru is found as item 92 and mon gre as item 93, with the Mongolian equivalents cited by Staël-Holstein. Note also that snrulas 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 entrée 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, KṢA, and KI-TSI) volumes, the Mahārātanakūṭā 6 (TSHI-‘I, the Buddhāvatānāsaka 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 讀史叢錄, 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 dhāranīs, 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 šatabhīṣā. 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 bzhugs so (Peking: Min-tsu ch‘u-pan-shē 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 šatabhīṣā, 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 Mahārātanakūṭā 6, the Buddhāvatānāsaka 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 khyi yid bzhin gyi nor bu myed pa lta bu’i dga’ bas rjes su yi rang). 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 *Mongoliam 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.22 Comp. Kazakevich’s Russian translation of Laufer’s *Skizze der mongolischen Literatur*, page 54.aq

as. The work mentioned is the Mongolskaia krestomatiia of Osip Mikhailovich Kovalyvski (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. Lauffer (Bulletin de l'Académie Imperiale des Sciences de St. Petersburg 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 lamaseray possesses (not on XX. 9a 2). Comp. page 157 of the Ōtani catalogue, according to which the *Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rdog 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. Lauffer'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. Lauffer gives 105 as the total number of volumes in the Hsi An Kanjur). Dr. Lauffer 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. Lauffer states that "der von roten Linien eingerahmte rechteckige Schriftsatz" measures 58.9 × 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. All the volumes described in the Ōtani catalogue are marked with Tibetan numerals (the ordinary numerals KA-PHE and the "extra" numerals OM and KSA), 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. Lauffer mentions a Kanjur Dkar chag, and does evidently not regard it as one of the volumes of the Kanjur.a)

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 rtan 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 Musée 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 如來大藏經總目錄, which we find on pages 1040-1053 of the first volume of the 昭和法寶總目錄.aZ This catalogue does not mention the Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud and states that the 22nd [ZA] volume of the Kanjur is occupied by Bu ston’s collection of dhāraṇīs (四部密咒中所集具大攝授咒併心咒疏及一億師傳名號).ba 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 dhāraṇīs is stated to occupy the superior first (上第一) volume and the Ral pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud ([婆 སྒྲོལ རླུའི སྡོད] the 22nd volume (i.e. the 23rd 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 dhāraṇīs 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 dhāraṇīs 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 dhāraṇīs 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.

---

a. Already in 1932 in his catalogue, mentioned above in note 8, 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 Gyutt; being the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th Divisions of the Tibetan Work, entitled the Kah-gyur.” Reprinted in Analysis of the Kanjur. Bibliotheque 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 Kanjou, recueil des livres sacrés au Tibet. Annales du Musée Guimet 2 (Paris: E. Leroux 1881). The ‘Jig rtan mchod bstod sgrub pa rtsa ba'i rgyud is the last work in volume zha of the Peking Rgyud.


ba. The reference is found in Shōwa Hōbō Sōmokuroku 昭和法寶總目錄 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. pumyaskandhaṇī, 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. 1570 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 zhi 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 Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, 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 以無悔發露懲故, 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 Taishô 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 Taishô XII 472a 15-16). The A. D. 1700 reading found on JU 316a 8 (me dang lung dang sdug bsgal dang) is also preferable to the A. D. 1692 reading: me dang sdug bsgal dang. Comp. Taishô 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 Saddharma-pundarikasūtra by Dharmarakṣa (日月暸) and Kumārajīva (日月燈) also agree with the A. D. 1700 Tibetan version. Comp. the Taishô 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. Saddharma-pundarikasūtra 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 buddhacakṣusā (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).be «16»

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, “Chibet-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 sTong 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 rajñāḥ Śubhavyāhasāntahpurāś caturarāṣṭir antahpurikāsahasrāny asya Saddharmapundarikāsya dharmaparyāyasya bhājanabhihātān abhīvan, 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 Subhavyāha became worthy of being receptacles of this Dharmaparyāya of the Lotus of the True Law. The correct Tibetan translation of the words antahpurāś caturāṣṭir antahpurikāsahasrāny would be: btsun mo’i ’khor los slas brgyad 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 sgur 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 emendations, 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: sarvasvatvaruta/kāśyapakahalāyunugate (A. D. 1692: sarvasvatvaruta/kāśalyanugate, the Skt. text of the Lotus sūtra, page 477: sarvasattvarutakahalāyunugate).b8 The A. D. 1700 editor has evidently forgotten to obliterate the faulty syllables kāśalya.b9 Kumārajīva transliterates the dhāraṇī, in which the expression (薩婆薩埵毘樓遮奇略合阿彌伽他) occurs, but Dharmarākṣa gives (a very imperfect) translation of it (曉衆生音). Comp. the Taishô Trip., vol. IX, page 61b, line 26-27, and vol. IX, page 133b, line 9. This is not the only dhāraṇī 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).b1


b8. This is a dhāraṇī, and thus transcribed in Tibetan. The Sanskrit here is found at 477.3.


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
defined by the adjective sīnayadharmaśaya-ātān (stong pa'i chos rtogs
par khong du chud pa). The A. D. 1700 ed. inserts the syllables stong
pa'i chos rtogs 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

Note 21.
On page 171 of my edition of the Kāśyapa-Parivarta 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 in 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 Kāśyapa-Parivarta are certainly wrong. ’I 123a 2: sens can yongs
stshol ba'i brtson 'grus so, Skt., page 142, lines 21-22: cittapari-ga-va-śatāye
vīryam, A. D. 1692: sens yongs su etc. ’I 123a 8: ‘jig cing 'jig 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.

The Chinese reference is Ch’ing-chu Ts’ai Yüan-p’ei Hsien-sheng Liu-shih-wu-sui
Lun-wen-chi: (Kuo-li) chung-yang yen-chiu-yüan li-shih yü-yen-chiu-so chi-
kan’. Wai-pien I A 慶祝蔡元培先生六十五歲論文集·(國立)中央研究院歷
史語言研究所集刊·外編第一種上冊.

bj. The Sanskrit is found on 186.10. No additional term is found either in the
Kashgar (Hirofumi TODA: Saddharmapundarikasūtra: Central Asian Manu-
scripts, Romanized Text [Tokushima: Kyōiku Shuppan Center 1981]) or Gilgit
(Shoko WATANABE: Saddharmapundarika Manuscripts Found in Gilgit. Part
Two: Romanized Text [Tokyo: The Reiyoukai 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 Bhadrapalaśrēṣṭhita-pri-
prachā 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 Bhadra-
palaśrēṣṭhita-pr parachā appears as the lag bzangs kyil [s] zhus pa (I omit
the Tibetan equivalents of ārya, of nāma, and of mahāyānasūtra). This
title is a translation of Skt. Subhāhuprachachā. In the Chinese block-printed
Dkar chag or catalogue mentioned above (page 15) and in the Chinese
Dkar chag compiled in the 昭和法寶誌總目錄 we also find the equivalent
of Subahu (妙手) where we would expect to find the equivalent of
Bhadrapala. The Bhadrapalaśrēṣṭhita-par parachā 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 Subhāu and Bhadrapāla (Śrēṣṭhin =
phag rgya = 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 Bhadrapala) might very easily be mixed up with
its homophone 妙守 (Miao Shou, which actually renders Subhāu 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 satasahasrika (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 brya (= 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 Susthitmati (Ōtani cat., page 250, line 18) appears as 意慧妙住
(mati + sūsthita) 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

bl. Marcelle LALOU: “La version tibétaine du Ratnakūṭa: Contribution à la bibliogra-
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 Vimaladattä], 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 満勝 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 (満 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 満 (or 圓満 etc.) or by a transliteration of the Skt. name Pūrṇa. To the Skt. title Pūrṇapramukha-avatāraśātaka (Ōtani cat., page 390, line 9) the words gang po la sogs pa’i rtags pa brjod pa bhrgya pa (Tib. Dkar chag, page 20a, lines 7-8) and 說網波等百悟經 (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 Rak 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 Rak pa gyen brdzes kyi rgyud, the Vidyutprātapataprīcchā and the Bhadrāpaḷaparīpṛcchā to their number) for the A. D. 1700 Kanjur. Comp. above pages 2 and 13. Owing to the insertion of the Bhadrāpaḷaparīpṛcchā into the middle of volume ‘I the great majority of its leaves had to be renumbered, and the Kāśyapaparīcchā, 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 Vidyutprātapataprīcchā caused less trouble, because the «19» proper place of that work is after the Ugraparīpṛcchā, 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 vepullya (instead of vaipullya) in the Skt. title of the first volume of the Buddhāvatānaśaka. Comp. page 14 of Beckh’s Verzeichnis and the first page of volume YI of the A. D. 1692 edition. Both collections designate the Vyāsapataprīcchā as the 48th le’u of the Ratnakāta, 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 brtses pa chen po’i chos kyis [sic] rnam grangs le’u stong phrag bhrgya pa las / drang srong rgyas pa’i zhus pa’i le’u zhes bya ste bzhis bceu rtsa bhrgyad pa rdzogs sho / le’u bzhis bceu dgu pa. The Vyāsaparīpṛcchā is the 47th le’u of the Ratnakāta (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.\footnote{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 LAUPER in his review of Beckh’s Verzeichnis (see note k, above), in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1914: 1128-1130.}

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

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 dhārāṇīs, 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. 

Peking, January 14th 1934.

\footnote{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 (Lang-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 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 dhāranīs as it appears in the A.D. 1692 edition.

Plate IIIb: Page 55a of Bu ston’s collection of dhāranīs 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).

[Plates V & VI: Missing.]

Plate VIIa: A page of the Tibetan translation of the *Saddharma-pundarikasutra* 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.]
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