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Abstract: Until recently the manuscript entitled Naran-u Gerel in the collection of St. Petersburg State University was considered to be the only extant catalogue of the 17th c. recension of the Mongolian Kanjur. The article presents a fragment of the Kanjur catalogue discovered among the manuscript fragments from Dzungaria preserved in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences. Its textual similarity to the Naran-u Gerel and structural proximity to the manuscript copies of the Mongolian Kanjur indicate that having been reflected in more than one catalogue the repertoire and structure of the 17th c. recension were not that random as it was previously represented in Mongolian studies.
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The oldest extant recension of the Mongolian Kanjur (a voluminous compendium of translated texts ascribed to the Buddha) was implemented in 1628–1629 under the auspices of Ligdan-qagan of Čaqar (1592–1634). It has survived to the present day in a number of copies, of which only the manuscript preserved in St. Petersburg State University Library (PK) represents the complete Kanjur set. The Kanjur catalogue called Naran-u Gerel, i.e. the Sun-
light, is attached to the initial volume of PK [NG(PK)]. The text of the catalogue was published by Z.K. Kas’ianenko in 1987. Her analysis of the catalogue demonstrated that its structure and content are different from both PK and the xylographic edition of the Mongolian Kanjur from 1717–1720 (MK), but closer to PK. At that stage of study its text was considered to exist in a single copy and represent one of the preliminary drafts of Ligdan’s recension.

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

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

---

1 Kas’ianenko 1987.
3 Alekseev 2015, 216–221. PK(NG) is not the only example of a catalogue that does not fully correspond with the manuscript it belongs to. In both the Tibetan and Mongolian literary traditions even the small lists could conflict with the repertoire and arrangement of the texts represented by them. Thus, for example, according to H. Tauscher, the volume dkar chags of the Gondhla proto-Kanjur show some deviations from the respective volumes, as they were probably mechanically reproduced from the model that was copied. Tauscher 2008, xlv.
4 See the information about its storage in YG, vol. 1. No. 05111.
5 On the Golden Kanjur see Alekseev and Turanskaya 2013.
6 See the description of NG(HH), the details of its publication and the catalogue itself in Erdeneclayu, Songqor 2013, 17–18, 172–207.
the same structure as NG(PK) that allows to identify it as a version of the same catalogue. Nevertheless, the Hohhot catalogue reveals some structural deviations from NG(PK) that do not let us recognize two texts as absolutely identical. Regrettably, the way NG(HH) was published makes it unclear if these deviations were inherent in the original of the catalogue, or they rather belong to the incomplete 1904 copy, or even to its 2013 publication.

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

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

\(^{10}\) On the so called black fragments of the Mongolian Kanjurs from Dzungaria see IAMPOLS’SKAIA 2015.

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

\(^{12}\) Fol. 17 of NG(JBF1) corresponds with the fragment on Fols. 8v–9v of NG(PK), which means that one NG(PK) folio is the equivalent of about 1.8 NG(JBF1) folios. So the whole NG(JBF1) catalogue could occupy only about 19–20 ff.
— the width of the vertical and horizontal lines of the graphemes is the same;
— the initial “teeth” do not have “crests”;
— the “loops” are small, sitting on the axis;
— in many cases the “sticks” are of virtually the same length as the “teeth” and differ from the latter only in their shape and the angle of inclination;
— the long and slanting downwards “tails” begin with a sort of angle, when the line first goes to the left from the vertical axis and then forms the “tail”;
— the initial “s” and “q” are almost indistinguishable from each other;
— the initial “t/d” has a shape of a drop with a small “tooth”;
— the medial “t/d” has the form of a short “loop”;
— the final “k/g” and “ng” have “snake’s tongues” while the orkica does not have this element.

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

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

[17r] @ [1] (NA1) sudur-aca arban jüg-ün bodisung-nar dalai ciṭulγun-u yeke bayasqulang-[2]un qa<u>rim-tur\(^{14}\) naγaduγci \(\{ya\}\) nereṭī\(^{15}\) yeke kölgen sudur: (NA2) anavatabta nereṭī\(^{16}\) luus-un qayан-u očīgσen nereṭī\(^{17}\) sudur: (NA3) qutuγ-tu sambay-a oyutu-yin\(^{18}\) [4] očīgσen nereṭī\(^{19}\) sudur: (NA4) qutuγ-tu

---

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

\(^{14}\) NG(PK): qaurim-tur.

\(^{15}\) NG(PK): nereṭī.

\(^{16}\) NG(PK): nereṭī.

\(^{17}\) NG(PK): nereṭī.

\(^{18}\) NG(PK): oyutu-yin (sic). Correct oyutu = Tib. blo gros.

\(^{19}\) NG(PK): nereṭī.
yekede\textsuperscript{20} ioništyýícı neretü\textsuperscript{21} yeke kölgen [5] sudur. (\textsuperscript{NAS} quturγ-tu bodisungs-

\textsuperscript{22} nar-un\textsuperscript{22} yůrbdapar-yi uqayulûşyan neretü\textsuperscript{23} sudur [6] bui:: : :: arban

\textsuperscript{24} yůrbdapar-yi pa\textsuperscript{25} gelmeli-tür: (\textsuperscript{PA1} bilig-ûn çinatu\textsuperscript{26} [7] kijayar-a kürügsen:
yọtaylûyucci\textsuperscript{27} vçir (\textsuperscript{PA2} quturγ-tu subikiran-ta\textsuperscript{28} [8] vikiram-i-yin\textsuperscript{29} bilig baramid bilig-ûn çinatu\textsuperscript{30} kijayar-a kürügsen [9] (\textsuperscript{PA3} jayun tabin yosutu: (\textsuperscript{PA4} )<bilig-

\textsuperscript{31} tû çinadu qijayar-a kürügsen tabitu:>;\textsuperscript{31} (\textsuperscript{PA5} bilig-ûn çinatu kijayar-a kürügsen\textsuperscript{32} cûşçuken\textsuperscript{33} [10] üsûg-tû; (\textsuperscript{PA6} bilig-ûn çinatu\textsuperscript{34} kijayar-a kürügsen kausika: (\textsuperscript{PA7} bilig-ûn [11] çinatu\textsuperscript{35} kijayar-a körügsen {jarim jayun-tu:} qorin tabun qayalγ-a-[12]tu: (\textsuperscript{PA8} bilig-ûn çinatu\textsuperscript{36} kijayar-a kürügsen {jarim jayun-tu:} (\textsuperscript{PA9} bilig-ûn [13] çinatu\textsuperscript{37} kijayar-a körügsen tabun jayun-tu:;\textsuperscript{38} (\textsuperscript{PA10} bilig-ûn çinatu\textsuperscript{39} kijayar-a [14] körügsen jayun naiman ner-e: (\textsuperscript{PA11} yeke

\textsuperscript{32} nigûleskî-i-yin cayan linqu-a-yin\textsuperscript{41} [15] neretü\textsuperscript{42} sudur (\textsuperscript{PA12} balasun-u idesi

\textsuperscript{33} neretü\textsuperscript{43} <yeke/>\textsuperscript{44} sudur: (\textsuperscript{PA13} quturγ-tu esru-a-yin 'çoy-[16]****/45

\textsuperscript{34} yiung***d\textsuperscript{46} öggügsen\textsuperscript{47} neretü\textsuperscript{48} sudur: (\textsuperscript{PA14} quturγ-tu dibangγar-a\textsuperscript{49}
burqan-a\(^{50}\) [17] yivanggirid ötgtesen nere\(t\)^{51} sudur: (PA\(A\)^{15}) /saran-u gerel-tü/\(^{52}\) qayan-u domo\(r\)-i [18] ütgüleküi; (PA\(A\)^{16}) j\(\ddot{e}\)ss-un\(^{53}\) adaliddaqqu sudur: (PA\(A\)^{17}) qotola-aca\(^{54}\) buyan-tu nere\(t\)^{55} [19] ****gün-ü\(^{56}\) sudur (PA\(A\)^{18}) siltayan-aca barilduji\(^{61}\) boluysan uridi kiged il\(y\)-i [20] uça\(r\)ulqu sudur nere\(t\)^{58} sudur ede bu:: :: arban dördügeb\(^{60}\) pha\(^{61}\) [21] {gemle} gelmeli-tür: (PHA\(A\)^{1}) qutu\(γ\)-tu qarin üllü nicucüi kirdün nere\(t\)^{61} yeke [22] kölegen sudur; (PHA\(A\)^{2}) jayan-u 62 nere\(t\)^{63} yeke kölegen sudur: (PHA\(A\)^{3}) qutu\(γ\)-tu [23] rasiyan nere\(t\)^{64} yeke kölegen sudur: (PHA\(A\)^{4}) qutu\(γ\)-tu mayidari-yin ****sen\(^{65}\) [24] naiman nom-tu{*} nere\(t\)^{66} yeke kölegen sudur: (PHA\(A\)^{5}) qutu\(γ\)-tu tegüncilen iregsen-ü [25] jirüken nere\(t\)^{67} yeke kölegen sudur: (PHA\(A\)^{6}) qutu\(γ\)-tu erdini\(^{68}\) qamuy ceceg delgeregse[n] [26] nere\(t\)^{69} yeke kölegen sudur: (PHA\(A\)^{7}) dabucayulysan ger-\(i\)-n sudur: (PHA\(A\)^{8}) qutu\(γ\)-tu [27] qubil\(ı\)-yan qatuytai-tur yivanggirid\(^{70}\) öggügsen\(^{71}\) nere\(t\)^{72} yeke {kölen} [28] kölegen sudur: (PHA\(A\)^{9}) qutu\(γ\)-tu nom-un mudur nere\(t\)^{73} yeke kölegen sudur: [29] (PHA\(A\)^{10}) qutu\(γ\)-tu\(^{74}\) yeke day\(u\)-n nere\(t\)^{72} yeke kölegen sudur: (PHA\(A\)^{11}) qutu\(γ\)-tu bodi jüg-i [17v1] uça\(r\)ulysan nere\(t\)^{75} yeke kölegen sudur: (PHA\(A\)^{12}) qutu\(γ\)-tu manjusiri-yin uça\(r\)ulysan [2] nere\(t\)^{77} yeke kölegen sudur:

\(^{50}\) NG(PK): burqan-i.
\(^{51}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{52}\) NG(PK): /saran nere\(t\)/.
\(^{53}\) NG(PK): jali\(\ddot{y\text{u}}\)-un.
\(^{54}\) NG(PK): qotola-aca.
\(^{55}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{56}\) NG(PK): köbegün-ü.
\(^{57}\) NG(PK): barilduqui.
\(^{58}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{59}\) NG(PK): dötüger.
\(^{60}\) In Tibetan. NG(PK): p\(\text{a}\).
\(^{61}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{62}\) NG(PK): add. {****} <kücün>.
\(^{63}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{64}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{65}\) NG(PK): öcigsen.
\(^{66}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{67}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{68}\) NG(PK): erdeni.
\(^{69}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{70}\) NG(PK): yivanggirid.
\(^{71}\) NG(PK): ög\(g\)-gügsen.
\(^{72}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{73}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{74}\) Sic. NG(PK): qutu\(γ\)-tu.
\(^{75}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{76}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).
\(^{77}\) NG(PK): nere\(t\).


Z.K. Kas’ianenko transcribes it as gü Kas’ianenko 1993, No. 713.

80 Sic. NG(PK) gives the same reading. PK gives the correct reading: küü < Ch. kou.

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

\[105\] NG(PK): tangγariγ-tai.
\[106\] NG(PK): d”ar-a.
\[108\] NG(PK): /a-a ra-yu a alavokite’ isvari-yin/.
\[109\] NG(PK): qutuγ-tu.
\[110\] NG(PK): kiling-tü.
\[111\] NG(PK): neretü.
\[112\] NG(PK): neretü.
\[113\] In Tibetan. NG(PK): add. Mong. ma.
\[114\] NG(PK): neretü.
\[115\] NG(PK): neretü.
\[116\] NG(PK): kimusutu-yin.
\[117\] NG(PK): neretü.
\[118\] NG(PK): ür-e-yin.
this the frequent use of the Uygur dāleth for “t” in NG(JBF1) is changed in NG(PK) for “t” proper: tangγariγ-dai > PK: tangγariγ-tai. In NG(JBF1) the words neretũ, cinatũ and erketũ (only one case in the text for the latter) are written with the use of the combination of the “loop” and the “tooth” to denote the medial “t/d” in front of the vowels. In the NG(PK) fragment such cases were not detected. The combination of the velar “q” and “i” is used only once in the correction in NG(JBF1): qijayara (in NG(PK) is given as kijayar-a).

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

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

\(^{120}\) The numbers of texts in PK are given according to Kas’tianenko 1993. On the correspondence between the PK and Peking edition of the Tibetan Kanjur (Q) texts see Uspensky 1997.

\(^{121}\) See Hackett 2012, Nos. 37, 516.
Vol. pa, Eldeb NG(PK) also marks the duplicate of the text in Vol. ja, of the Dandir-a section. It also notes that during the translation from Tibetan into Mongolian small Prajñāpāramitā texts from the Shes rab sna tshogs section were mixed with other sūtras and placed in the Eldeb section of the Mongolian Kanjur. It is possible that the Naran-u gerel catalogue reflects both the dichotomy of the text under consideration and the relocation of one of its duplicates to the Eldeb section.

| 8–18 | 675–685 | Of them NG(JBF1) PA 17 (= PK No. 684) does not have a counterpart in the Tibetan Kanjurs of the Tshal pa group. |

Eldeb, pha

| 1–7 | 686–692 | Of them NG(JBF1) PHA 6 (= PK No. 691) is the translation of the Ratnakūṭa text different from the one included in the Ratnakūṭa section (= PK No. 583). The duplicates of this text are included in several Kanjurs of the Them spangs ma group. For example, the Ulaanbaatar Kanjur also has its duplicate in Vol. pha of the mDo sde section. |

| 702–703 | 8–15 | 694–701 | Of them NG(JBF1) PHA 13 (= PK No. 699), unidentified by V.L. Uspenskii, is the counterpart of Q No. 850. Its substantially edited version is included in MK. NG(JBF1) PHA 14 (= PK No. 700) is similarly placed in the mDo sde section in the Kanjurs of the Them spangs ma group; in Q it has two duplicates, Nos. 718 and 1040 placed in the rGyud and 'Dul ba sections correspondingly. |

Eldeb, ba

| 1–2 | 702–703 |

---

122 Kas’ianenko 1987, 173, 181.
123 Kas’ianenko 1987, 178. The list of the texts and their location see in Alekseev 2015, 220.
125 See RKTS https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/verif/verif2.php?id=78.
126 See Erdeničilayu, Šongqor 2013, 198 No. 72–08.
128 Ligei 1942–1944, No. 938.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt; 792</td>
<td>NG(JBF1) BA3 does not have a counterpart in PK, <em>Eldeb</em>, Vol. 3. It is located in Vol. 792 of the <em>Eldeb</em> section (No. 792). NG(PK) places the text both into <em>Eldeb</em>, ba and ya. NG(HH) mentions this text only in the ya volume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–16</td>
<td>704–717</td>
<td>Of them PK Nos. 713 and 714 do not have identifiable counterparts in Q. NG(JBF1) BA 15 corresponds with PK Nos. 715 and 716. In the “standard” Tibetan editions of the Kanjur these texts, as well as PK No. 717, are included in the Danjur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>NG(JBF1) BA 17 does not have an identifiable counterpart in PK. It is presented in both manuscript catalogues with some minor variant readings as the <em>Ary-a avalokita isvari-yin marygkal</em>, but absent in NG(HH). The text, possibly, can be a translation of one of the prayers to Avalokiteśvara (Skr. <em>stotra</em>, Tib. <em>bstod pa</em>) located in the Danjur (considering the use of the genitive in the Mongolian translation of the title, most probably, Q 3554 or 3561).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>718–719</td>
<td>PK No. 718 is a <em>stotra</em> from the Danjur (Q 3533). Both texts are included in NG(HH).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–19</td>
<td>possibly, 720–721</td>
<td>Have no identifiable counterparts in Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>The text is also absent in NG(HH). Has no identifiable counterparts in Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>NG(JBF1) No. 20 does not have a counterpart in PK and is included only in the block-printed edition of the Mongolian Kanjur. Absent in NG(HH).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

130 For the classification and location of this text in the Tibetan Kanjurs see HACKETT 2012, No. 294.
131 ERDENICIAYU, SONGQOR 2013, 201 No. 83–03.
132 In NG(JBF1) these texts are also presented separately ERDENICIAYU, SONGQOR 2013, 198 Nos. 73–14, 73–15.
133 See USPENSKY 1997, 143.
134 See SUZUKI 1962, 381–382. Interestingly a short prayer to Avalokiteśvara was discovered among the tantric manuscripts from Dunhuang. As noted by T. Dalton and S. van Schaik: “This prayer is not similar to any of the Avalokiteśvara *stotra* texts in the *Bstan 'gyur*” DALTON, VAN SCHAUK 2006, 41.
135 The text is missing in the main part of the V. L. Uspenskii’s *Concordance* but mentioned in the Index. USPENSKY 1997, 159.
136 ERDENICIAYU, SONGQOR 2013, 198 Nos. 73–17, 73–18.
137 USPENSKY 1997, 144.
138 USPENSKY 1997, 144.
139 LIGETI 1942–1944, No. 1079. See the classification and position of the text in the Tibetan Kanjurs in HACKETT 2012, No. 337.
The discovery of the *Naran-u Gerel* fragment among the folios of the Dzungar Kanjurs in the library of IOM, RAS and its textual proximity to the manuscript preserved in the St. Petersburg State University Library prove that NG(PK) was not a single copy of the catalogue representing some preliminary draft of the Ligdan’s recension of the Mongolian Kanjur, as it was previously believed. In general both NG(JBF1) and NG(PK) duplicate the structure of the volumes *na*, *pa*, *pha*, *ba* and *ma* of the *Eldeb* section in PK and other manuscript copies of the Mongolian Kanjur. This observation possibly indicates that the structure of Ligdan’s recension, which still remains a conundrum for the scholars, was not that random. Some differences between the catalogues and the complete manuscript Kanjur sets probably reflect different stages of Kanjur formation in both the Tibetan and Mongolian cultural worlds. Some of these structural peculiarities that also occur in the Tibetan Kanjurs of the *Them spangs ma* group possibly point at an archaic Tibetan source or sources that were used when the Mongolian Kanjur was created in the 17th c.
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